Vol. IX.] MARCH [No. 1

THE

MALABAR QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

K. N. SIVARAJAN, B. A.

CONTENTS. PAGE

I. Methods of Reform.
By Mr. U. PADMANABHA KUKILLAYA, M. A. 1

II. Tolstoy, The Man and the Meaning of Life-II.
By Prof. KAMAKHYA NATH MITRA, M. A., B. L. 8

III. The Ramayana-An Historical Study.
By Mr. P. V. NANU PILLAI, B. A. 23

IV. The Nationalisation of Land.
By Mr K. PARAMAESWARAN PILLAI, B. A., B. L. 37

V. The Morality of the Ramayana---A Rejoinder.
By Mr. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M. R. A. S. 45

VI. The Law of Karma.
By Prof. S. A. DESAI, M. A., LL. B. 61

VII. An Astrological Office.
By. Mr. B. N. BHAJEKAR. 68

VIII. Reviews and Notices. 70

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY S. K. PILLAI FOR THE PROPRIETOR,
AT THE P. J. PRESS, TRIVANDRUM.

Annual Subscription,
Rs. 5.

1910

Single Copy,
Re. 1-6-0.

THE

MALABAR QUARTERLY REVIEW.

EDITED BY

K. N. SIVARAJAN, B. A.

Vol. IX] MARCH, 1910 [No 1.

METHODS OF REFORM.

By Mr. U. Padmanabha Kukillaya, M. A.

"I am only repeating what I have already said times out of number that the work of nation-building must be begun from below. The nation that has to be built up lives in huts and not in palaces. Legislative councils, principally composed of the latter, are not likely to be the best instruments of building the nation from below".

The above quotation from a recent article of a well-known Indian public man, sums up in a most emphatic manner the criticisms that may legitimately be brought against the methods of reform both political and social that are followed now in India. For years there has been a striking similarity between the methods of the two reform movements. The advocates of both have been chiefly members of the educated classes and they have alike satisfied themselves with an organization the most noticeable feature of which has been the entire absence of association between the educated minority and the 'uneducated' majority. In the political field the bulk of the people has been left aside as consisting of men who are too ignorant for their opinions to be of any value. The educated few have seldom made any serious attempts to inform the "people", to educate them in politics, to teach them a just appreciation of the problems of political life, to organize them into a body which can exercise an appreciable control over public

affairs. Instead they have claimed themselves a representative character with a coolness equalled only by the Anglo-Indian of a certain type, who poses as the arbiter of our destinies and the mouth-piece of our "voiceless millions". Uuder the circumstances it is no wonder that the official says that he has as much right to call himself the representative of the people as the Congress politician has. The mistakes that have been committed in the field of political reform have been repeated in the perhaps more important field of social reform. The advocates of social reform have really made it a sort of satellite to the Congress. The Congress wheel drags it; it parades the country after the Congress; it occupies the back seat and it utilises the cast-off crumbs of the dominant partner. Grand conferences are, no doubt, held, eloquent speeches are delivered, impassioned appeals are made year after year. The conferences *resolve* and the resolutions are printed. Meanwhile the bulk of the people go on as they ever have been going on. The newspapers devote columns after columns to telegraphic summaries and full text reports of Congress speeches. For a month to come the editorial columns are filled with comments on the resolutions of the Congress. But the social reformers are just mentioned and they have to be satisfied with a few reported speeches and an editorial column of commonplaces. Unlike the resolutions of the Congress the resolutions of the Social Conference are meant mainly for the people. But many people never read them; more people do not care for them; and most people in the country do not even hear of them. What is the result? The social reformers are treated as nobody's representatives and their resolutions carry neither weight nor authority.

The poor progress made by the cause of reform in our country is due to many causes. But the most important cause, we may hold, is the attitude of the bulk of the people. The method of reform now pursued leaves them altogether untouched. It is the nation that must be revolutionised and not a few people here and there. But the nation cannot be touched so long as the work of reform is carried on as it is now. The great preachers of the world, whether religious or social, never satisfied themselves with making set speeches to select audiences; they never harangued in the language of foreigners; they never cared for the grand theatrical way of doing things. The reformer must be of the people; he must talk in the language of every day life; he must know his people and his people must know him; his life must be as theirs and his work must be constant and unremitting. How differently is the work of reform carried on in our country! The Conferences are

something like periodic exhibitions. Those that attend the political meetings stay on for a couple of days more if they have the leisure, and take part in moving resolutions and making speeches in support of them. They then disperse to meet again a year hence. It is highly doubtful whether even the delegates at these Conferences are unanimous over every one of the resolutions passed. It is a question whether every one who attends and cheers is really heart and soul in sympathy with the cause of reform. It is a positive fact that many of these delegates do absolutely nothing to promote the cause of reform just where their exertions are likely to meet with good fruit. Even the European Christian missionary tries to adapt himself to local circumstances. He sometimes dresses as we do. He sometimes tries to talk to us in our vernaculars without the aid of an interpreter. He finds his audience not in the well-dressed critically disposed gentlemen that grace a lecture hall but in the rough illiterate common people whom he can find in market squares and under the shade of trees. He has understood that to convert a country he has to convert its people—not a small class among the people. His is the true line of work, he cares little for *tamashas*. But among us the ways are different. The man who regards himself as thoroughly reformed is often also the man who is most denationalised. He regards his countrymen as so many ignorant, superstitious, obstinate, never-do-wells with whom the less he has to do the better. There is hardly any true sympathy, much less any co-operation, between the "chosen few" and the vulgar many. And the result is the "chosen few" walk one way and the unredeemed many walk another way. The unredeemed are the majority and so the country is theirs. And the few think that they have done much for their country, but really they have helped to form a few more castes—as if we have not castes enough!

Resolutions to be binding must be come to by those who resolve to bind themselves thereby. A resolution moved by a Bengali and supported by a Punjabi and acclaimed by a body of Mahrattas—what influence can it have among a body of Tamilians living hundreds of miles away? These resolutions of our Conferences are meant for millions of Hindus, but we Hindus really do not form a single people. Our customs, languages and prejudices differ and therefore for a resolution to be of any real effect it must be come to not in a grand central durbar but in each district and each village if possible. Let us take an example. The next All.-India Conference will meet at Lahore. The audience will largely be Punjabi. A good gentleman

from the United Provinces may move a resolution to the effect that the marriage age of girls ought to be raised. A friend from Bengal and another from the Central Provinces may second and support this proposition. The Punjabi audience will acclaim this resolution and it will be passed with all due honour. Here we are in the remote south. No doubt the resolution is meant to remedy an evil which is common to most of us. But most of us are but ordinary men; we are made of the common clay; we are, to confess the truth, little cowards in our own way however brave our words may be. We may like to see many things done, we may like to do many good things ourselves. We are in entire sympathy with the cause of social reform; but there is one little draw-back however. We do not share these good opinions and intentions with the members of our community. A few are bold enough and strong enough to cut themselves adrift from the community rather than subscribe to its ways and usages when they do not approve of them. But the bulk are not so heroic and they would wait to see a change in public opinion at first. But this change in public opinion—not the opinion of the press and the platform—is slow to come, because grand conferences of a cosmopolitan nature can hardly produce any effect in a country where there are hundreds of peoples, talking hundreds of dialects and following hundreds of usages and traditions.

Of course it can be pointed out that other conferences are held than the annual All-India Conference. There are provincial and district social conferences as there are provincial and district political conferences. But these are really only miniature models of the grander conference. They copy the methods of the latter and they are equally cosmopolitan in their nature. Let us take for example a provincial conference held in a Telugu district. There will be 'representatives' of many a caste and creed and talking many a language. They will meet and a few speeches will be made in English and perhaps in Telugu also. But whose representatives are these and what portion of the province in whose name they meet is likely to be influenced by their resolutions? Even the district conferences are open to the same criticism. The bulk of the people cannot be influenced in this way. In some cases they have even taken a decidedly hostile attitude towards the reform movement. The social reformer among these "old-fashioned people" is often regarded as an infectious beast to be kept at arm's length. His good intentions are misinterpreted and every action of his is distorted and held up to cheap and

ignorant ridicule. But no reformer can escape these; he must be prepared for a great deal of ill-treatment. Still there is no reason why he should not avoid ill-usage when he can do so, why he should not choose the way which is least offensive to his neighbours.

The question thus is, are there any other ways of reform? The answer is supplied by the existence of a few caste conferences here and there, *e g.*, the annual conference of the Kayasthas, the Uriyas, the Nairs etc. It is in the field of reform more than anywhere else that there is the greatest need for 'decentralisation.' You have to work with units and small aggregates of units before you can think of revolutionising millions. Therefore it is necessary that each community must first confine its endeavour to the amelioration of its own conditions. Politically we may all have the same interests more or less, but socially our interests are different and our needs are of various kinds. Hence it is necessary that each community must first examine its own constitution, find out its defects and set about the work of reform in right earnest. As far as possible the business of these reform meetings must be conducted in the vernaculars and the members of these meetings must be really "representative," i. e, they should not be confined to the educated classes. I shall illustrate my position by taking an imaginary example. The Tamil Brahmans form a large population. They talk the same language, their customs are generally alike and their standard of civilization is fairly uniform. They meet together, let us suppose, periodically to discuss questions concerning their communal welfare. Once in a quarter or so a very large number of them representing all sects and classes among themselves—from the Europe returned savant to the sanctified purohit—hold their confercnce in a large Tamilian centre. They go neither to preach nor to be preached to. Their desire is to discuss in a friendly way and to come to some sort of agreement over some social question or other. They meet and elect for their president some highly respected member of their community. They talk only Tamil and they wish to pass resolutions representing their real intentions. There will be a list of subjects prepared by a small committee before-hand. These subjects are all of importance to the community. Let us take the following as typical of the subjects mooted for consideration:

1. Intermarriages between the various sub-sects among the Tamil Brahmans.
2. The marriage age of girls.

3. The education of girls and women.
4. Encouragement of foreign travel.
5. Remarriage of virgin widows...........

These questions have been discussed in the great 'cosmopolitan' conferences too. But our Tamil Brahman conference also discusses them These Tamil Brahmans in conference assembled discuss what concerns them and nothing more. They abandon lofty flights and grapple only with those problems that affect them and that are clearly felt and understood by all of them alike. They suggest remedies that many of them have long thought of but which they have not had courage to put into execution. But now they find they have others in their company and that consequently they have less to fear. The conference now resolves to do a thing—it resolves, let us say, to readmit into the caste people who have travelled to foreign countries. Let it be remembered that this resolution is come to not as a pious opinion but as a determination on the part of the people concerned to do a thing. Perhaps in the beginning some of these resolutions may be nothing more than expressions of opinion, but in course of time they are bound to become acts of what we may call a communal legislature. An All-India Conference is, in its nature, incapable of giving expression to a determination on the part of any community, but a caste conference will do that. It speaks for itself and therefore it carries more weight and has infinitely greater chances of success. Here in every sense of the term the reform is from within, and reform from within is likely to meet with greater chance of popular favour than reform preached from without. Further it is here alone that questions of a purely communal nature which grand conferences of the existing type may pass over as of not sufficient importance, will receive the consideration they deserve.

It may be objected to this scheme of reform that instead of breaking up the system of castes it may perpetuate it. This is just one of those questions that always threaten to destroy the work of reform. The wisest policy, it is thought, would be to leave the question of caste alone. At this stage in our social evolution, to begin the work of reform by a frontal attack on the citadel of caste is the surest way to court disaster. There are other questions more pressing and more important and more easily solved. It would be better to grapple with them first and then to think of the caste system. The battle over caste will be the hardest, and it is doubtful how far the opponents of the system will meet with the success they hope for. So far as we

can see at present the cry often is to pull down those above but not to raise up those below. There are those who would like to see the Brahman cease to be a Brahman; but ask them to treat a caste "lower" than their own as their equal in every way and then you will see heroic declarations followed by undignified hesitation and lame explanations. Sincere men there are everywhere, but everywhere there are more men who are not sincere.

U. P. KUKILLAYA.

TOLSTOY THE MAN AND THE MEANING OF LIFE—II.

By Prof. Kamakhya Nath Mitra, M. A., B. L.

But for Tolstoy to wield the pen as he wielded the sword it was necessary that the venue must be changed. St. Petersburg is the centre of literary activity in Russia and thither Tolstoy bent his steps. His fame had preceded him while he was alternately wielding the pen and the sword in the Caucasus and in Crimea. Men of letters are by nature gregarious and Count Tolstoy could not be in his element unless he found a place in the society of authors. The liberal and democratic movement in Russian literature had already begun and Turgenieff and Dostoyefsky were the protagonists of this movement. Turgenieff had already attained European reputation and received Tolstoy with open arms. He also made the acquaintance of the poet Schenshin, otherwise known as Fyett, whose name deserves mention because the only good verses of Tolstoy are those addressed to him. Puschkin edited the journal to which all these luminaries regularly contributed. It was during his residence in St. Petersburg that Tolstoy wrote the incomplete story "Youth," "The Notebook of a Scorekeeper," "The Two Hussars," "The Blizzard" and "Albert." "The Notebook of a Scorekeeper" is one of the most slashing criticisms that Tolstoy has ever written of the life around him.

For sometime all went well with Tolstoy, but again he was becoming dissatisfied with himself. Cliquism is the bane of literary life. In England in the Elizabethan age there was the Mermaid Tavern with Ben Jonson as its presiding genius. After the Restoration of Charles II, Dryden domineered over the poetasters of his time at Will's Coffee house and had it pretty much his own way. In what has been called the Silver Age of English Literature Addison the mildest of men was the soul of the Kit-cat club. Dr. Johnson was the oracle of the famous Literary Society and when he opened his lips to dogmatise all listened with eager attention including even Burke and poor Boswell jotted down every opinion good, bad and indifferent. In the Nineteenth Century there were the Lake poets and in these degenerate days perhaps there are Societies for Mutual Admiration galore.

There was a similar coterie in St. Petersburg of which the oracle

was Turgenieff who majestically imposed his methods and views on the wretched band of his cringing followers, but the bold and original mind of Tolstoy could not stand this literary bully. There was a rift in the lute and soon after a complete estrangement.

Most of these literary men in spite of their tall talk of culture and progress had a very frail organisation. They had their vices and vice is in its nature contagious. No man is entirely above his times; and Count Tolstoy, his passion for goodness notwithstanding, contracted the vices of his brother-literati and St. Petersburg Society. Besides the world, the flesh and the devil are always too strong for us. But fortunately Tolstoy had a strong conscience and that is how he was saved.

I have stated some of the reasons of Tolstoy's dissatisfication with the literary society of St. Petersburg, but the greatest cause of his discontent was that even here he did not find answer to the ever-recurrent question about the Meaning of Life. Of course during his stay in St. Petersburg he learnt all the glib talk about the Indestructibility of Matter, Conservation of Energy, Protoplasm, Evolution and all the *isms* of your philosophy together with some of the *ologies*, but the pilgrim was as far from his goal as ever. There was only one faith in which he still worked and that was his faith in the meaning of poetry and in progress in life, but this faith was also soon destroyed. Count Tolstoy himself tells the story of this loss of faith in his *My Confession*. I quote his very words: "Faith in the meaning of poetry and in progress in life was a creed, and I was one of its priests. It was very agreeable and profitable to be its priest, and I lived for a long time in that belief, never doubting its truth. But in the second and especially in the third year of that life I began to have my doubts about the infallibility of that faith, and started to investigate it. What gave me the first impulse to these misgivings was the fact, which I noticed, that all those priests were not at one among themselves. Some said: We are the best and most useful teachers; we teach what is necessary, but the others teach incorrectly." And others said: "No we are the real ones, but you teach incorrectly." And they disputed, quarrelled, scolded, cheated. and deceived each other. Besides, there were many people among us who did not trouble themselves to find out who was right and who wrong, but who simply attained their selfish ends by means of that activity of ours. All that made me doubt the truth of our faith". And it is characteristic of Tolstoy that he should now ask himself: Why should I write books then? Work with-

out an object? We all know that that cannot live. So Count Tolstoy turns his back on St. Petersburg and its literary society. His literary fame sasisfied him as little as his military fame and so in 1857 he sets forth on a tour abroad to come in personal contact with the forward movement of Europe and proceeded straight to Paris, the Mecca of Russian intelligence.

Tolstoy did not go abroad like the ordinary globe-trotter with his sketch-book and camera. His object was to study civilisation at first-hand. It is not necessary to give a detailed account of his journey through Europe. He passed rapidly through Germany without stopping in that country, though he noticed that it was a land full of courage and vigour. The gay crowd of Paris did not appease the hunger of his heart. Even Italy with her art-galleries, ancient ruins, blue skies and heaving seas interested him not. In fact, "he walked through Italy like an iconoclastic Puritan", but this Italian visit is fruitful of one important result in that it enabled him to formulate a theory of art about which I may have occasion to say something later on. England and Germany he reserved for his second visit. Of all the countries of Europe that he visited this time Switzerland is the only country of which he speaks with enthusiasm. Here Nature stands in all her beauty and grandeur and his artistic soul was deeply touched. He writes in his *Luzerne*: "As I went up to my room and opened my window toward the lake, I was literally dazed and overwhelmed in the first moments by the beauty of the water, the mountains, and the sky. I felt an unrest, a desire in some way to give expression to the overflowing emotions which were suddenly filling my soul...But neither on the lake, on the mountains, nor in the sky was there one straight line visible, or one definite colour, or yet one quiet point; everywhere there were motion, irregularity, arbitrariness, endless variety of light and shade, but also in everything the quiet, the softness, the harmony, the necessity of the beautiful". At the sight of what man had done, he feels just like Ruskin and passes this caustic remark: "And here, in the midst of this indefinite, confused and wild beauty, there stared at me from under my windows, stupid and foolish, the white line of the boulevard, the linden trees with their supports, the green benches, poor miserable works of human hands, which did not disappear in the surrounding loveliness, like the distant villas and ruins, but which coarsely opposed it."

Count Tolstoy has great regard for England but an instinctive horror of the English tourist. It is said that an Englishman grumbles

if he finds that there are parts of the world not at all like the suburb of London and Thackeray has said that Englishmen do at Rome not as Romans do but as Englishmen are in the habit of doing generally. All observers agree that the English tourist is a very disagreeable person, very noisy, very proud and very obtrusive. When he goes to the continent he carries himself like a lord and treats the peoples of the countries he deigns to visit as so many "natives" and inferiors. If he goes to Egypt to see the Pyramid he must break his soda-water bottle against the statue of Sphinx. No wonder then Tolstoy studiously avoided the English tourist, but who can resist the decree of Fate? After all that he did it was an English tourist that made him the bitterest enemy of modern civilisation. The anecdote is very interesting and I quote it in full.

"One day he comes in touch with a poor, dwarfed musician who plays on his guitar and sings the songs of the mountains before a hundred admiring guests of the hotel, and afterwards is sent away without the smallest reward for his work. Tolstoy pityingly follows the man, talks to him, and returns with him to the elegant hotel in which he played. He takes him to the dining-salon, and is refused admittance because of his companion; but in spite of opposition he enters with him, and a well-fed, well-dressed Englishman leaves his table and complains because of the intrusion". Verily, it is the first chapter of the book of Snobs over again.

It is a very simple incident, one "that has been and may be again", but it rouses the righteous indignation of Count Tolstoy to a white heat. In this one wronged man he sees the wronged humanity and in the attitude of the inmates of the hotel he sees the whole attitude of modern civilisation. This may be generalising from a very slender datum and there may be a want of proportion and perspective in his indictment of modern civilisation, but it reveals the whole man to our expectant gaze.

During his first European visit Count Tolstoy did not come into contact with great European scholars. He studied modern civilisation in its broad outline and was sorely disappointed. It had nothing to tell him about the meaning of life and with a heavy heart he returned home.

From 1857 to 1859 Tolstoy spent his time mostly in Moscow with long intervals at Yasnaya Polyana and one or two visits to St. Petersburg. During the year 1859 he wrote two stories, *Family Happiness* and *Three Deaths* which fully maintain his literary reputation.

In this year he starts again on a tour abroad and visits England and Germany. Germany could not fail to interest Tolstoy, being the land of modern philosophy and Social Democracy. At Berlin he heard a number of lectures on sociological subjects, attended sessions of the Worker's Union, listened to a few lectures at the University and carefully observed the public-school system. From Berlin he went to Dresden where he visited Berthold Averbach, a kindred spirit, who has revealed the German peasant in his stories as Tolstoy has revealed the peasant of Russia. Next he went to Kissingen where he met Julius Froebel, a nephew of the founder of the Kindergarten system and exchanged with him views on education. It is in Germany that he came under the influence of Schopenhauer "the Great Buddhist of Frankfurt" whom he began to read and appreciate. From Germany he went to France, stopped at Marseilles, visited the public and industrial schools and came in touch with the social movement of France. After a brief stay in Paris he left for London. I have already said that Count Tolstoy has a great regard for England, though he does not like the English tourist. In the words of Tolstoy: "It is the country of the noblest ideals and yet also of the coarsest materialism." He felt himself specially attracted to Ruskin to whom he was closely related in spirit. Tolstoy attended a session in the House of Parliament, visited the Tower and the dreadful east side of London, where he saw civilisation at its worst. Then he went to Brussels and after a short stay there returned to Russia by way of Germany, where he visited Weimar consecrated to the genius of Gœthe and Eisenach sacred to the memory of Luther. In a visitor's book at Eisenach he made a laconic entry: "Luther is great." Let us also say: "Tolstoy is great," for Tolstoy is the Luther of Russia.

In 1861 Tolstoy was again in St. Petersburg, and from there he went to Yasnaya Polyana *via* Moscow. We have seen that during his second visit to Europe he took great interest in the educational question and with his mind full of pedagogic ideas asked the Government for the privilege of opening a public school at his native village—a prayer that was granted.

But Tolstoy had not yet received answer to his question about the Meaning of Life. A great weariness of spirit was coming upon him and he longed for Home and Rest. Home up to this time he had none but a happy home he was destined to have. The dream that he had of a "Life by the side of a pure woman who would breathe peace upon him and who, while sharing his labour, would

increase his joy" was about to be realised, Tolstoy was a philosopher, but even philosophers fall in love and Tolstoy was no exception to the rule. There is an amusing story of Aristotle in love. It is said that the great philosopher was once in love, and the lady promised to listen to his prayer if he would grant her request. The terms being readily accepted, she commanded him to go on all fours, and then, putting a bridle into his mouth, mounted on his back and drove him about the room till he was so angry, weary and disgusted that he was quite cured of his foolish attachment. No such thing, however, happened to Tolstoy, but what happened might have been a great tragedy indeed. Sofia Andreyevna was about sixteen years his junior. Tolstoy was thirty-four and this young lady about eighteen. She had an elder sister but Tolstoy was so unreasonable at this time that instead of falling in love with her he fell in love with Sofia. His biographer does not tell us whether Sofia was at the same time ready to be fallen in love with but I strongly suspect she was. Unfortunately there is many a slip between the cup and the lip. In these matrimonial affairs, man proposes no doubt but it is not God but generally the mother-in-law that disposes. That is just what happened here. When the mother-in-law heard about the hymeneal designs of Count Tolstoy, she stared and gasped and said to her husband: "Lor! Did you ever?" Sofia's father who, I am afraid, was rather hen-pecked, at once replied: "By Jove! No I never!" and the husband and wife both agreed that their eldest daughter must be married first. If Tolstoy had been a Hindu, perhaps he would have said: "Come on, don't bother, I am going to marry both;" but being a Christian he could only threaten to shoot himself if the father persisted in his refusal. The father saw that things were growing serious and at last gave his consent. The wedding took place on the 23rd of September, 1862 and Countess Tolstoy has proved a good, faithful and loving wife and has borne her husband several children. The limits of this paper will not permit me to say much about Tolstoy's philosophy of marriage, but I may say this much that according to Tolstoy marriage is an elevation for such as we; true marriage is the marriage of the heart and has nothing to do with the flesh and that even married life may be adulterous if this truth be forgotten.

Count Tolstoy now leaves off his peregrinations for good and settles down as a useful citizen at Yasnaya Polyana. From this time forward till the year 1877 his life was one of manifold activities.

He was judge, teacher, farmer, journalist and last but not least author. We have seen that immediately after leaving the University he tried this sort of life but was sorely disappointed. But the circumstances in Russia were now changed. The *mujik* suddenly took an interest in life and learnt to respect himself. On the 19th of February, 1861, the memorable edicts liberating the serfs was promulgated by Czar Nicholas throughout the length and breadth of Muscovy. After the close of the Crimean War, there was acute discontent in Russia. The patient *mujik* suffered most from the consequences of that cruel war and Russia was on the brink of a terrible revolution. The humane policy of Czar Nicholas allayed the grave discontent. He did not give his subjects stone when they wanted bread nor did he tell them with his tongue in his cheek to deserve liberty before they desired it, for Nicholas knew and felt that it is liberty alone that fits a nation for liberty. He knew and felt that it is a rogue only who tells a man not to go into the water till he learns to swim.

Count Tolstoy characteristically enough had set his serfs free long before the law was passed. He saw that there was a change in the temper of the people and the *mujik* wanted to improve his lot. Count Tolstoy said to himself "Now or Never" and set about the task in right earnest.

I will not weary you with the details of all that Tolstoy did during this period of his life, but shall confine myself to his educational activities which cannot fail to be of profound interest to India at present. We have seen that Count Tolstoy very closely watched the public-school system in Germany and had an interview with the nephew of Froebel, the founder of the Kindergarten system of training for children. Tolstoy compared notes, thought deeply and elaborated a system of his own. In 1859 he organised two schools near his estate and in 1861 a third one was added. He had brought with him a German Assistant and four University Students from Moscow, whom he had trained for this special task. In December of the same year a fourth school had to be opened; and before long Tolstoy was the superintendent, principal and teacher of twelve different schools which he constantly visited and in which he taught the Russian language, singing, drawing and Biblical history and tried to impart some manual training. During this period he also wrote many moral tales, fables for children and stories for children—some of his folk-tales having their origin in his school-room visits. He retold the

Arabian Nights according to Russian taste and wrote what is regarded as one of his finest folk-tales, "God sees the truth though he does not tell it at once." We hear a good deal about the moral and religious training of our boys now-a-days; yet I do not understand why our Universities and Educational authorities do not prescribe some of these folk-tales for our secondary schools. They have been translated into very good English.

In these days of educational experiments in India--and India is the land of experiments—Count Tolstoy's theories on education will be highly interesting. There is no humbug about Count Tolstoy. We hear a good deal of systems, methods and discipline; and masters and mistresses of method are being imported from abroad by almost every incoming Mail-Steamer. There is a regular hierarchy of Inspecting Officers and if they go on multiplying at the present rate we shall have more Inspectors than Teachers soon enough. But what good purpose they serve in this world of God and who is to keep in custody the custodian nobody can tell. Do you think we can't take care of our own boys?

Our colleges were hitherto free from the tyranny of these Inspectors, but they have suddenly sprung into existence like Minerva from the head of Jupiter in complete panoply. When I see one of these University Solomons striding into our nest, I feel strongly tempted to begin like one who shall be nameless but five letters do form whose name: "Whence and what are thou—" well, the rest must be understood. Sometime ago one of these Solomons sent his *salam* to your humble servant. Well, I obeyed the *salam*, but said inwardly: "Confound you! What the dash have I got to do with you?" Then I was treated to a long homily on the teaching of English, for that is my subject. Of course, it all came in at one ear and went out at the other. I yawned and was just going to doze away when I was quite startled by his *Juridar* or colleague—for these gentlemen are coupled together—to keep each other lively I suppose—suddenly striking in with these ominous words: "And look here, the English that you teach must also be idiomatic." *Risum teneatis.* It is not his fault that he could not articulate the letters 't' and 'd' for verily he had come from the *Vaterland*.

On another occasion I had an encounter with an Irish Solomon He had the good-breeding to ask me if I was a *bona fide* teacher. I answered that that was my humble conviction. But he was bent on heckling me and so his next question was whether I said that to please

him. I felt strongly tempted to say; "Now, Pat, stop your humbug-will you? Why the dash should I care to please you of all people in the world?" But he was perched on a platform, however artificial and must look over my head. So I summoned all the philosophy I could and thought like Tolstoy when he put on his coat and trousers for the first time, that it had to be, for who can resist the inevitable?

And this sort of farce is going on under our nose in the name of Educational Reform. If you want to create a few sinecures, I have no quarrel with you. Create them by all means, but I insist that you must call a spade a spade.

As I have said already, Count Tolstoy's theories of Education are profoundly interesting. He defines Education as "a human activity which has back of it a desire for equality in knowledge and the fundamental law of the self-progression of knowledge" and concludes by saying that "we must go to school to the children and not the children to us." The first principle which Tolstoy has announced is that there should be absolutely no compulsion used anywhere in any way. Perfect liberty is his watchword. The second principle is that there is to be no imitating any method; there is, indeed, to be no method at all. Tolstoy holds that it is not the business of the schools to train, but to educate, for training rests upon force and law, and has its reason in the policy of the state, the church, the family and society as they are. He firmly believes that Education should be based on the individuality of the child who should enjoy the completest liberty and from whose sight everything that is instinctively dreaded should be entirely removed. He also says that without the Bible the Education of the child in the present state of society is quite impossible. These are the views of Tolstoy on Education. Let our Inspectors and Masters of Method stare and gasp.

While Tolstoy was busy with his schools and theories of Education he was also engaged on two monumental works—*War and Peace* and *Anna Karenine*—works that have been translated into all the European languages and are universally read with pleasure and profit. I cannot offer here a literary criticism of these great works. So far as *War and Peace* is concerned I shall content myself with saying this much only that the characters here are but the mouth pieces of Tolstoy's view of life which was fast crystallising into a regular system of philosophy and sociology. Says Tolstoy: "In notable historic movements, the so-called great men are the labels, which name events and periods; but just like the labels, they have the

least to do with the events." To Tolstoy the masses are the real hero. Those whom we call heroes reap all the glory, do nothing and so have no right to exist. The followers of Carlyle will shriek at this no doubt, for "the histories of nations are" according to him, "but the biographies of great men", but the truth seems to lie somewhere between the extremes. We must reconcile the claims of Collectivism and Individualism.

As for *Anna Karenina*, I have already quoted the opinion of Matthew Arnold. Let me add only this that the book is full of auto biographical interest and that is perhaps why it is considered the master-piece of Tolstoy. It is ever so. Thackeray's *Pindennis*, Dickens' *David Copperfield*, Charlotte Bronte's *Jane Eyre* and Victor Hugo's *Les Miserables* are considered the cream of fictional literature for the simple reason that fact is stranger than fiction. Like Hugo's *Les Miserables* it has also an epic grandeur of its own. It is the epic of Russian civilisation. It is a libel to call it a mere realisitic novel.

Of all the characters that Tolstoy has portrayed it is Levine whom he resembles most. Levine's experience is his own experience and the story of Levine's conversion is the story of his own conversion. The pilgrim's progress comes to an end. At last he is in sight of the Promised Land and cries out Eureka! Eureka!

No archbishop or hierophant ever could convert Tolstoy. He was converted by a very simple process. It is from the mouths of babes and sucklings that we hear words of wisdom. The apostles of Christianity were the Fishermen of Galilee.

I reproduce the story as it has been told in his celebrated novel: "On one of his bad days Levine was in the field with his peasants, and one of them happened to say to him in answer to a question from him why one farmer should in a certain case act more humanely than another: 'Men are not all alike; one man lives for his belly, like Mitiovick, another for his soul, for God, like old Plato (not the philosopher—it is a common name among Russian peasants). 'What do you call' cried Levine, 'living for his soul, for God'? The peasant answered: 'It's quite simple—living by the rule of God, of the truth. All men are not the same, that's certain. You yourself, for instance, wouldn't do wrong by a poor man'. Levine gave no answer, but turned away with the phrase, *living by the rule of God, of the truth*, sounding in his ears".

The question here naturally arises: Have we not heard these words ever in our life? If we have, why do they not sound in our

ears as they sounded in the ears of Levine?—For the simple reason that we never feel like Levine. All true illumination must come from within. The kingdom of God is within you. But to find it you must go, seek and knock. As the hart panteth after the water-brook, so your soul must pant for the Lord. Never think that by simply mumbling a set form of prayer and by saying Lord! Lord! you will reach the Kingdom of Heaven. The Gate of that Kingdom will be slammed in your face.

Now, the soul of Tolstoy panted for the Lord. Stale, flat, weary, unprofitable were to him the uses of the world. He did not feel happy even in the bosom of his family. He had already begun to question himself: Why should I live for my family? as once in his life he had asked, Why should I fight and why should I write?

The state of Tolstoy's mind at this period has been described by himself. I quote his words in full from his *My Confession*:

"What happened to me was that I, a healthy, happy man, felt that I could not go on living—an insurmountable force drew me on to find release from life. I cannot say that I *wanted* to kill myself. The force which drew me away from life was stronger, fuller, more general than wishing. It was a force like the former striving after life, only in an inverse sense. I tended with all my strength away from life. The thought of suicide came as naturally to me as had come before the ideas of improving life That thought was so seductive that I had to use cunning against myself, lest I should rashly execute it. I did not want to be in a hurry, because I wanted to use every effort to disentangle myself: if I should not succeed in disentangling myself, there would always be time for that. And at such times, I, a happy man hid a rope from myself so that I should not hang myself on a cross-beam between two safes in my room, where I was by myself in the evening, while taking off my clothes, and did not go out hunting with a gun, in order not to be tempted by an easy way of doing away with myself. I did not know myself what it was I wanted. I was afraid of life, strove to get away from it, and at the same time expected something from it."

Such was the state of Tolstoy's mind and therefore God heard him and gave him what he wanted.

The success of *Peace and War* and *Anna Karenina* was phenomenal. If Tolstoy had an ordinary mind, he would have gone on writing novels till the end of his days. But he must give to the world what he had received and so washes his hands of novel-writing

business and turns his attention to Religion, Philosophy and Theclogy. He has translated the Four Gospels in the vernacular of Russia with a rational interpretation and so ranks with Wycliffe and Luther. He has also written a Critique of Dogmatic Theology. His other books are: *My Religion, On Life, What shall We do then? The Kingdom of God is within you, Resurrection, Miscellanies* and a few more works which as far as I know have not yet been translated into English. He has also written a few dramatic works.

Count Tolstoy is to-day 81 years old and he is still writing, working and struggling for his brother-men. The man who brings the peace must also bring the sword and no wonder that his voice has been raised over and over again against the wrongs of State and Church, Czar and Priest. Throughout his life he has been the people's man and his mission it has been to uplift the fallen. We may not agree with him in all that he has said, for there are many faults of exaggeration in his writing due to an over-sensitive nature. But take him for all in all, we shall not look upon his like again. A great soul and a great writer, our knees naturally bend before him as before a Master. Be it his to live many years more to continue his blessed work on earth!

In the course of what I have said I have already touched upon some of the views of Count Tolstoy. I cannot well conclude without speaking about them at greater length. And first of all his political teachings.

It is the political teachings of Tolstoy that have been so much misunderstood. Count Tolstoy has been called an arch-anarchist, though he has said over and over again "Resist no evil and do not break the peace in the name of patriotism". We must not be blind slaves of words. Verbolatry, if I may coin a word, is as bad as idolatry. Don't boggle at the name of anarchism, for Tolstoy does not. Tolstoy glories in that name but with an important qualification for he calls himself a Christian anarchist. If by anarchism is meant organised assassination or a reign of terror—if anarchism means bringing about an ideal order of things by means of revolutionary violence, then Tolstoy is not an anarchist. But Tolstoy believes that all Government is an evil, as it exists because of our transgressions. It matters very little whether you call a Government autocracy, aristocracy, plutocracy or democracy. Government is at best a necessary evil. If men are good and God-fearing there is no necessity for Government. Tolstoy is neither an Individualist

nor a Socialist—yet he is both. When he tells you to take care of your soul, he is an Individualist. When he tells you to love your fellow-men even as yourself he is a Socialist. His ideal is that of the kingdom of God on earth—the ideal of the Puritans of England. You may call him a visionary if you like, but I tell you once for all that nothing great in the world has been done except by the visionaries. Moses, Buddha, Christ, Mahomet—Savanarola, Brutus, Mazzini, Rousseau—Shakespeare, Milton, Dante, Gœthe—they have been all visionaries—all dreamers and the world lives on their thought. Unless Youth sees visions and Age dreams dreams the millennium will be as far off as ever.

But it is with the religious teachings of Tolstoy that we are most concerned. The centre of his faith and of the Christian religion he finds in the Sermon on the Mount—the pith, he says, of the New Testament as the Decalogue is the pith of the Old. The doctrine of non-resistance seems to him the most important and over and over again he says: "Force must never be used, even in the suppression of evil, and wrong can effectually be righted by repaying evil with good" He has formulated five rules of conduct which may be summarised thus :—

1. Live at peace with all men and do not regard any one as your inferior.

2. Do not make the beauty of the body an occasion for lust.

3. Every man should have only one wife and every woman only one husband, and they should not be divorced for any reason.

4. Do not revenge yourself and do not punish because you think yourself insulted or hurt. Suffer all wrong, and do not repay evil with evil; for you are all children of one Father.

5. Never break the peace in the name of patriotism.

You may reasonably ask here: "How is it that Count Tolstoy who tells us not to resist evil himself is so bellicose that he calls the Czar assassin and the priests hypocrites"—to which my reply is: How is it that Christ who has consigned those who call their brothers fools to the danger of hell-fire has himself called the Pharisees a generation of vipers? Resist moral evil you must, for that is the law of your being. You cannot serve two masters, God and Mammon.

You may also ask: How is it possible to do anything without the application of force? It is the verdict of History that nothing great has been achieved without the shedding of blood and Milton

has said "Force by force must be ejected when the conquered can"?—to which my reply is that the last chapter of History has yet to be written. Froude, himself a great historian, says that history never repeats itself. Be it ours to create history and not merely to follow it. Whether any great thing is possible or not without the application of force, we should at least try non-resistance. What harm is there if we give it a chance? Have we not tried many questionable things in our time of life? And what is the good of talking of bloody revolutions? Frederic Harrison observes that the most foolish question is about the justifiability of the French Revolution. You ask: Was the French Revolution justifiable? I answer: Is the Earthquake justifiable or the volcanic eruption justifiable? We never determine the Revolutions—it is the Revolutions that determine us. Remember there is such a thing as what the Germans call *Zeitgeist* or Time-Spirit. If you say that it is a most fatalistic view of History, then I can but tell you again not to be the slaves of words. This is what Count Tolstoy says: "What form the state will have, what results its actions will bring, I do not know. I know only that if I follow the promptings of a reasonable love, the results cannot be evil." According to Tolstoy the whole aim of life is self-sacrificing labour for others. That is also the teaching of Christ, of Buddha and of the Reeshis of the Upanishads. That is also what you have read in the Holy Grail. You must lose yourself to save yourself.

You may again ask here; "But where is Tolstoy's originality?"—to which my reply is: "In this that he has *felt* all this as very few people have ever felt." I tell you, there is nothing original under the sun. All great truths are old truths. Only they are ever old and ever new.

Tolstoy's theology is very simple. Indeed, to be great *is* to be simple. Tolstoy's theology can be summed up in two words—God is our Father and all men are our brothers. In regard to the person of Jesus, Tolstoy is an agnostic. It does not matter to him who he was; whether God or man but his word is divine, it is the law of God revealed through Jesus, and in that he has implicit faith; greater faith than most people who know all about Immaculate Conception, Thaumaturgic Art and Physical Resurrection.

You may very well say here: "If this is Christianity, we are all Christians"—and so are we. *Ilalla*, we are also Mahometans, for does not Islam mean submission to the Will of God? We are also

Hindus, for the voice from the Upanishads chants forth the rich melody *Santam Sivamadwaitam.*

"One God, one Law, one Element
"And one far-off divine event
"To which the whole creation moves."

My task is done. I hope I have given you a fair idea of Tolstoy the Man. I hope I have given you a fair idea of true religion as I conceive it to be. But what does it avail you to talk of religion if you do not apply it to life? Therefore,

In the first place, you must stand as far apart from vague pantheism which is a delusion and a snare as from Polytheism and Idolatry—an insult to the intelligence of a rational being.

In the second place, you must disregard all restrictions on food and drink and abolish caste—a blighting institution inconsistent with true religion, being based as it is on hate and not on love.

In the third place, you must uplift the women of India. They are your mothers, sisters and daughters—and if any of you is so very fortunate, then one of these very women is perhaps to you what Beatrice was to Dante. It will never do to neglect them. As long as they are neglected, you will never receive the blessings of God. Remember, the Divine Mother suffers in them.

But above all, do not forget that the Kingdom of God is within you. That is the message that has gone forth from Nazareth; that is the message that was proclaimed from beneath the *Bodhi-droom* not far from this place; it is this message that has gone forth from the caves of the Himalayas and has been wafted from the banks of the Ganges and the Indus; and this is the message again that vibrates through the Upanishads and the Geeta. Carry this message to the tiller of the soil. The real soul of India is there, lying stunned, bruised and crushed by the hard blows of centuries. There is no hope for India until that soul is roused. Awake! Arise! go forth and preach the message from door to door. Tell one and all: "The Kingdom of God is within you. Hear no voice but that of the spirit within. There is no such thing as Death. Resurrection is the law of life" This Resurrection of India—this Kingdom of God on earth is the dream of my life and my only wish is that before the dust of my frame returneth to dust and this feeble voice is hushed to death, I may say with the pious Jew of old: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation".

THE RAMAYANA—AN HISTORICAL STUDY.

BY MR. P. V. NANU PILLAI, B. A.

OF all the great literary productions of ancient India none is more widely popular or is more generally appreciated by Hindus of all classes and of different degrees of intelligence than the Ramayana of Valmiki. There are greater and even sublimer works, such as the Vedas and the Upanishads. But none of them except the Maha Bharatha can be said to be so well-known to and appreciated by the people at large. Even the Maha Bharatha is not so much an epic poem, as it is an encyclopœdia of ancient Hindu legends and folklore, collected and collated by successive authors known by the general designation of Vyasa. Further it is an unwieldy work, perhaps the longest poetical work in the World. The Ramayana, on the other hand, is the work of a single author Valmiki justly known as the *Adikavi* or the first poet. He is not merely first in the order of time, but first also in the order of merit. Of all the epic poems in the world, the Ramayana stands unparalleled. Its peculiar fascination lies in the compactness of the story, in the chasteness and the simplicity of its language, in the loftiness of its ethics and above all in the religious instruction which it imparts to its votaries. The word *Rama* is a household name in every Hindu-family. It has such significance to the Hindu mind that it is almost synonymous with the name of God—so much so that the very uttering of the word, a number of times, constitutes a round of prayer in the case of an ordinary Hindu. The word Rama is derived from the word *Ram* which means to *please* and it is used in the sense of *Atmaram i e*, that which pleases the soul. It is therefore no wonder that the epic poem which celebrates the deeds of Rama has so much charm to the Hindu mind. It is to the Hindus what the Bible is to the Christians, the Koran to the Mohammadans the Avesta to the Parsis and the Bodhisathwa to the Buddhists, The story of the Ramayana is a simple one and a brief summary of it, in as few words as possible, will be a fitting introduction to the subject of this paper, as in the course of our discussion, frequent allusion has to be made to it.

Dhasaratha, king of Ayodhya, is afflicted with the sad thought that he has no son and the reflection " *Aputraspagutirnasti*" *i. e.* the

"sonless have no salvation" makes him quite miserable. With a view to beget a son to whom to bequeathe the kingdom which has had an uninterrupted line of succession, he performs a great yagam to propitiate the gods. Pleased with its austerity, they bless him with four sons. The eldest of these, born of Kausalya one of the three consorts of the king, was called Rama. The next one Bharatha was born of Kaikeyi. Sumithra gave birth to the twins Lakshmana and Sathrughna. When Rama came of age King Dhasaratha made preparations to install him on his throne and seek rest in forest which his growing years and the custom of his country rendered necessary. Jealous of the preference shown by the Raja to the son of Kausalya, Kaikeyi demands of the King the fulfilment of a promise made by him in former days that her wishes would be gratified whatever they might be and whenever they were pressed forward. The King to whom truth is the highest law of being and justice is an application of it to human affairs, complies at once with Kaikeyi's request to banish Rama to the forest and to install his son Bharatha in stead. Thus Rama goes into the woods followed by his beloved wife Sitha and his faithful brother Lakshmana. They wander in the forest from hermitage to hermitage for about ten years when they settled down near Nasik. At this time Ravana, King of Rakshasas, visits the hermitage of Rama during his absence and stealthily takes Sitha into his aerial car and carries her away to Lanka. The brothers then set out from there in quest of Sitha, form an alliance with Sugriva, the King of the monkeys, get across to the island of Ceylon, engage Ravana in battle, vanquish him outright, recover Sitha and return to Ayodhya where Sri-Rama was crowned as King.

The Ramayana like many other Indian epics is a story founded on solid facts of history. It is a history of the Aryan colonisation of South India. If by history is meant a correct record of the doings of the people at any period of their life, their habits, manners and customs, their mode of living, their way of fighting, the causes of their wars, the weapons they used in battles, the religions they professed, the ethics they followed and the gods they worshipped, we have in the Ramayana, copious materials which will afford a faithful history of the Indian people at a period long anterior to the Christian era.

The poem begins with the description of Ayodhya and an eulogium on Dhasaratha and his ministers. The city of Ayodhya is described as being situate on the banks of the river Sarayu, studded

with forts and fortresses, with towers and palaces. The city is peopled by the different orders of society, the Brahmans, the Kshathrias, the Vaisyas and the Sudras. The Brahmans were treated with the highest respect. The Kshathriyas occupied a position next in rank to the Brahmans. The Vaisyas formed the common folk. The Sudras were serfs in the employ of the other three classes. They were the descendants of the conquered aboriginal races not much advanced in civilisation and were naturally treated therefore as servants. Dhasaratha had eight ministers of the cabinet, all of them being Brahmans. Vasishta and Vamadeva were the foremost of them. Of the eight members, *Purohda* was the chief family priest and religious adviser to the king answering to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Next comes the *Prathinidhi*, an ambassador; next in order is the *Pradana* or the Prime minister. The next is *Suchina* or the war minister. Then comes *Manthri* or the chief counsellor. *Praswivaka* or the chief judge of the Privy Council, *Pandhitha*, the expert in Sruthis and Smrithis and *Sumantharaka* or the private Secretary to the King, make up the cabinet of those days in strict conformity with the ordinance of Manu. The poet next describes the grief of Dhasaratha on account of his being heirless. The next chapters deal with the birth of the children and their early training. They studied the Vedas and the Sastras before the age of sixteen. Intellectually and morally therefore they had no superiors. In physical pursuits also they were trained from their infancy. They were the sons of a king and as such they were trained in the use of swords and arrows and in all other manly exercises. In fact they did not neglect one branch of education to the detriment of the other. They bestowed the greatest attention upon the training of the body which we in these days of degeneration do not care for. They realized the principle that without a healthy body, healthy morality and healthy intellect were impossible. From these facts you will see how fallen the modern Hindus are in their notion of education.

The poet next goes on to describe the Swayambaram of Sita and the intrigues at the Court of Ayodhya by reason of which Rama is banished into the Dekhan which is described as a huge forest inhabited by races unfriendly to the Aryas.

Coming to the South of India, the poet brings us face to face with no less than half a dozen different varieties of humanity. First, we are introduced to Guha, who is described as the head of a nomadic race of people who lived upon the roots and fruits of the forests and upon the flesh of wild animals which they hunted. They had no

houses but dwelt under the shades of trees or in temporary huts thatched with leaves. They were not unfriendly to the Aryans, but acknowledged their superiority. The depth of contempt in which these people were held by the Aryans may be seen from the fact that Bharata becomes astonished to hear that Sri-Rama shook *hands with* Guha. That Sri-Rama should pollute his person by the touch of an unclean Kiratha was really a matter of wonder and surprise to his brother Bharata. Going still more south into the Dekhan the poet brings to our view, the cannibal Viratha whom Rama kills. The poet gives us only one or two instances of cannibals whom Sri Rama is said to have slain. The fact is that when the Aryan colonization of South India began, they found some places inhabited by cannibals whom they at once destroyed. Next we are introduced to the great Rakshasas and the Monkey races.

As I have already said the story of the Ramayana is a history of the Aryan colonization of South India. Sri Rama, though he is a single individual should not be treated as such. He is simply the representative of the Aryan people who have colonized the countries of South India as far as Nasik. To the south of Nasik lay the great Rakshasa Kingdom and a little to the east was the Kingdom of the Monkeys. These Monkeys and Rakshasas should not be looked upon as quadrumana or demons. They represented the two prominent races of South India at the time of the Ramayana. The Rakshasas as their name indicates were a fierce race of people who scorned the supremacy of the Aryans and had withstood all their attempts to aryanize them through long ages. They occupied the countries to the south of Nasik on the west coast of India. This country extended up to Cape Comorin and thence to Ceylon. They were a considerably civilized people. They were armed with swords and spears. The science of archery was also known to them. But they excelled in the use of swords. They were perhaps acquainted with the sea and knew the art of navigation. Their chief is said to have had an aerial car. They had a feudal system among themselves consisting of petty lords or generals who followed their king whenever called upon to do so. They were not illiterate. Their chief Ravana is said to have been conversant with the Vedas and the Sastras. He had a fortress in his city of Lanka which is described as impregnable. He had two brothers whom he treated as his colleagues. He had his uncles also of whom we hear only in the first part of the story. They seem to have governed the country of Hindustan near Nasik; for they were the first to take the field against Rama to chastise him for the mutilation of Sur-

panaka. Ravana had two or three sons of whom Indrajit is the foremost. He is the eldest but in no place is he treated as the heir-apparent. He is treated rather as a favoured general. Ravana had a sister to whom is ascribed the cause of the war. She had a husband first who died; and she seems to have had children by him. But she was young and wanted to remarry. The Rakshasa women were free to choose their husbands. As she was wandering in the outskirts of the empire she met with two handsome youths from the north; and naturally she felt an inclination towards them. But they mutilated her.

Coming next to the Monkey race as they were called, we find them to be a partially civilized people having their king, their government, their ministers and officers. They had a fort in which were the houses of their chiefs and their dependents. Their king Bali is described as a powerful chief, who was feared by all. He is also a religious man and used to say his morning and evening prayers regularly. This king had an army which was large, but they had no weapons except clubs and sticks. They were a strong and well-built people. They had a settled system of inheritance. But they were mostly black and were probably on that account called Monkeys by the Aryans. They seem to have been the descendants of an Assyrian race of people who entered India at a very remote time. They were the worshippers of Surya or the Sun. Their king Bali worshipped this deity in the morning and evening. Their other chief Sugriva is called the son of Surya and Hanuman their minister is said have been a pupil of the same deity. These facts go to prove that they were an Assyrian colony that settled in India from time immemorial. They were a peace-loving race and were mostly vegetarians living upon fruits and roots. They had heard of the powers of the Aryanized Kshatrias and had taken to learning their language. Hanuman is described as speaking the Sanskrit language with a fluency and accent that astonished the brothers Rama and Lakshmana. They were therefore easily brought under the Aryan influence and turned out to be a great source of strength to the Aryans in the war that followed.

Now that I have given you a description of the Rakshasas and the Monkeys and have made you understand that they were men like ourselves, let me resume the thread of my narrative. The Aryans, I told you, had colonized all countries to the north of Nasik; and to the south of Nasik lay the kingdom of the Rakshasas. These Aryans were an agricultural people, and wherever they went they reclaimed

forests and tilled the soil. They lived upon the milk of their cattle and the produce of their soil; occasionally they used to hunt and eat of the venison. Their chief was called Rama or Sri Rama which name is perhaps identical with the Hali Rama of the Mahabharata· Hali Rama means the Rama with the plough and as such is a typical Aryan farmer. His wife was called Sita which again means a furrow and is again symbolical of Aryan Agriculture. In the borders of their colony they frequently came in contact with the Rakshasas and had on one occasion maltreated their women having cut off their noses and ears. Ravana, the king of the Rakshasas, was duly informed of this outrage and he soon came to chastize the enemy. He planned a novel mode of compaign. He knew the Aryans to be good archers and perhaps knew his own weakness also. He therefore called in the aid of Maricha who is described as assuming the form of a golden deer and enticing away the brothers, Rama and Lakshmana. This golden deer is again symbolical of wild cattle. Maricha collected a herd of wild cattle and let them loose on the crops of the Aryans.

Seeing that their crop was in danger of being destroyed all the male members went to the rescue of the same. In the meanwhile, Ravana and his followers entered their houses and carried away their implements of agriculture and all their women. When the male members returned home they found their homes plundered and deserted. They at once set out in search of their women and property. They first met with Jadayu who is described as a bird, but who in reality was the typical pariah slave of the period. He was not given entrance into the houses of the Aryans, but was allowed to live at a respectable distance from the residence of his lords. He lived upon the carcasses of men and animals. But with all that he was a faithful servant; and as such he did his best to save the women and property of his master. But he was no match to Ravana who at once cut him down with his sword. He just lived long enough to tell the story of the kidnapping of Sita.

Then the poet describes the search of Sita by Rama and Lakshmana. After many adventures, they meet with Hanuman, the minister of Sugriva. Sugriva was driven away from his kingdom by his brother Bali and was living as an exile in the forest. So there was much of mutual sympathy between Rama and Sugriva. They enter into alliance as a sequel to which Bali is killed in battle by Rama and the kingdom of Kishkinda is given over to Sugriva. Rama and Sugriva then find out the whereabouts of Sita and attempt to cross the Ocean. At this

time Vibhishna, the traitor-brother of Ravana privately sees Rama and enters into a secret alliance with him.

With the powerful assistance of Sugriva and with the no less powerful support of Vibhishna Rama crosses over to Ceylon, enages Ravana in battle, kills him and all his men and installs Vibhishna as King of the Rakshasas. Vibhishna in gratitude for his leige-lord takes Sita back and places her at his feet. After this Rama returns home and reigns as sovereign. Here ends practically the story of the Ramayana. From the account just now given you will find that by this war, the whole of South India including Ceylon was subdued by the Aryans and that these countries were in due course completely Aryanized.

I have now told you that the history of the Ramayana was the history of a war between the Aryanized Kshatriyas of the north and the non-aryanized Rakshasas of the South. In this war the Rakshasa power was completely subdued their kingdom being made tributary to the Empire of Ayodhya. The downfall of the Rakshasas was due partly to intrigues among themselves and partly to the powerful support the Aryans derived from the Assyrian inhabitants of India but mostly to the mental and moral superiority of the Aryans.

Now the question may naturally arise as to who these Rakshasas were. Were they Kshatrias? Or as such were they a branch of the Aryan people? Did they belong to the Monkey race? Were they a separate race of people differing from all these? Are they in these days represented by any peoples of India?

For this purpose we have to draw a comparison between the races already treated of. First let us proceed with the question whether the Rakshasas were Monkeys and try to answer it.

1. The Monkeys are described as vegetarians, which the Rakshasas were not.

2. The Monkeys though they were a strong and well-built people were not as fierce and war-like as the Rakshasas.

3. The Monkeys were a peace-loving people. But the Rakshasas if they loved anything at all, loved war.

4. Hanuman and Sugriva are described as men almost resembling Monkeys. But Ravana is described as Dasahasya, that is a double Panchahasya, which means broad-faced.

5. Bali and Sugriva worshipped the sun. But Ravana and his people worshipped Siva.

6. The Monkeys were not much learned as the Rakshasas. Ravana is said to be conversant with the Vedas and the Sastras.

7. The Monkeys had no weapons except clubs and stones. But the Rakshasas were skilled in the use of swords and spears. They knew also the art of archery.

8. The Monkeys lived in an inland country and were afraid of the ocean when they first saw it. The Rakshasas lived, some of them at least, beyond the ocean and knew the art of navigation.

9. The Rakshasas in spite of their being fierce were a more civilized people than the Monkeys.

10. The Monkeys had a system of inheritance which was from father to son. But the Rakshasas had no settled system. Ravana gets his kingdom not from his father who was a Brahman Sage; but he inherits his kingdom through his mother's ancestors. Again Ravana's kingdom goes to his brother and not to his son.

11. Lastly nowhere is it said in the Ramayana that these two peoples were inter-related. In fact the Rakshasas despised the Monkeys as did the Kshatriyas also.

Now let us see whether these Rakshasas were Kashatrias and as such Aryans.

1. They were like the Kshatriyas a warlike people.

2. Their women like the Kshatriyas were free to choose their husbands.

3. They like the Kshatrias worshipped Siva. Almost all the Siva temples in Northern India are ascribed to the prathista of Janaka and other Kshatriya kings. The Siva temples in South India are ascribed to the Prathista of Kara and other Rakshasas.

4. It was the custom among the ancient Kshatriyas when any family was going to become extinct, to beget children in Kshatriya women by Brahmans. This practice was followed in the case of Ravana.

5. Among the ancient Kshatriyas Polyandry and Polygamy prevailed as may be seen from the stories in the Mahabharata. The Rakshasas were also subject to this custom.

6. The Rakshasas used to do penance as did the Kshatriya kings But when a Sudra did it he was punished with death by Sri Rama.

7. Again the Kshatriyas of the Mahabharata are described as having Asura blood in them Whence did they get this Asura blood if they did not belong primarily to the Asura stock?

In all these respects the Kshatriyas and the Rakshasas agree. Let us now see wherein they differ.

1. The Kshatriyas professed caste and acknowledged the social superiority of the Brahmans which the Rakshasas did not.

2. The Kshatriyas had a fixed system of inheritance which, we have shewn, the Rakshsas had not.

3. The Kshatriyas performed yagas or Brahman rites which the Rakshasas made it a rule to obstruct.

4. The Rakshasas though they were once polyandrous and polygamous had become entirely mono-androus and monogamous at the time of the Ramayana.

These are the points of difference. But the points of agreement are more numerous and important than the points of difference which may be explained away by saying that Kshatryas had completely aryanized themselves under the moral influence of the Brahmans.

Now a theory may be formulated which I hope will explain the complete aryanisation of the Kshatrias.

The Aryan Brahmans entered India not as conquerors but as spiritual teachers. For they even to this day trace their descent from some spiritual guru or Rishi. These gurus were headed by a religious chief called Manu; and there were a number of successive Manus whose duty it was to make laws and regulations for the conduct and guidance of their followers from time to time. These laws and regulations are what are known as the Manava Dharma Sastras The mission of the Aryans was thus at first a peaceful one. But in course of time they were forced to take up arms, just as the English merchants later on were forced to do so for their defence. These Aryans were mentally and morally the superiors of the peoples that inhabited India at that time. These latter belonged either to an earlier wave of the Aryan exodus to the South or to the kindred family of the Semitics or were probably a mixed race composed of both. But all accounts go to shew that they were a people closely allied to the Aryans. They were the worshippers of Siva and the idols and were probably divided into three orders of Society but not into castes, the then orders being the king and their followers, the landlords and merchants, and the serfs or servants.

It was at this juncture that the Aryas entered India just as it was when the Hindus were divided into four castes that the Mahomedans invaded the country. The Puranas and Itihasas describe the struggle that was going on for long ages between these Aryas and the non-Aryanized natives of India.

Many of these latter were in due course completely Aryanized and were called Manavas or the followers of Manu. The term Manava was at first a term of contempt applied by the natives of

India to denote a follower of Manu just as the term Christian was a term of contempt applied originally by the Ancient Jews to denote a follower of Christ.

The Manavas were divided into four castes as the Brahmans, Kshatrias, Vysyas and Sudras of whom the Brahmans or Bhusuras were the descendants of those rishis, who entered India for proselytizing while the remaining castes were taken from society as it was then existing in India. But apart from these four castes, there remained a fifth class of people made up entirely of the natives of India who preferred to worship their own gods rather than submit to the gods of the Aryans. These people fled to the south of India and were called by the Aryas as Asuras and Rakshasas which terms originally meant only the ungodly or the infidel as opposed to the Aryas who were called the Suras, the godly or faithful people by pre-eminence.

With the advance of the Aryans and the Aryanized natives southwards the Asuras also receded until at last all the plains of India and even Ceylon came into the Aryan possession. These Asuras and Rakshasas are then described as taking shelter in a place called Pathalom. It is from the confines of this Patala that Malyavan the father of Kykesi is described as going out in search of a kinsman to marry his daughter. But finding none, he marries her to the rishi Visravas by whom she gets three sons Ravana, Kumbhakarna and Vibhishna. When these princes grew up they regained their lost possession of Lanka and re-asserted their former predominance. It was to destroy this predominance that the Ramayana war was undertaken and the precautions taken by the Aryans to completely overthrow the rising Rakshasa power correspond exactly with the precautions taken by the English in order to subdue the rising Maohmedan power of Tippu.

Now one word about Pathala and I have done with this historical aspect. Where was this Pathala? Was it an under-ground world or was it any country in India itself? I say it is no under-ground world. It was some place in South India itself where the non-Aryanized population of India took final shelter. Let us then see what part of South India corresponds exactly with the description of the Pathala mentioned in the Puranas.

I think that the country bounded on the east by the western ghats on the north by the mountains near Nasik and on the west and south

by the sea was probably the Pathala of the Puranas. The synonyms for Pathala are അധൊഭുവനപാതാളം ബലിസത്മരസാതലം നാഗലൊകശ്ചകുഹരൊ &c. Adhobhuvana means an underground world, Balisatma means the country of Mahabali, the Asura chief, Nagaloka means the country of the serpents and Kuhara means a cave.

This country on the Malabar Coast which I have mentioned is the only place even now for a pursued army to take final shelter in South India. It was not known to the Aryans until a very late period. The Ramayana professes to be entirely ignorant of the countries south of Nasik. This country is called even to this day as Papa Bhumi, the country of the *Papis* or Barbarians by the Hindus of the place. It is an underground world when looked down from the western ghats. It is again at the foot of the world when viewed from the hills. It is this country in which even to this day the memory of an Asura chief is cherished with joy and enthusiasm. Onam and other festive days are all in commemoration of the ideal Asura king Mahabali. In no other part of India will you find the memory of an Asura chief so much cherished. Again the Malabar coast is the abode of serpents by pre-eminence. It is noted for the number and variety of its serpents. In no part of the world will you find serpents being worshipped as in Malabar. No other country of the world can boast of special serpent priests called Pullavars even to this day. These Pullavars are perhaps the descendants of a serpent worshipping people who were subdued by the Asuras. The present Nairs are probably the descendants of those Asura warriors who defied the power of the Aryans in the plains and who when they found that resistance was hopeless to defend the plains sent first their women and children into this country beyond the ghats and stationed powerful military guards in all the passes that opened the country to the outer-world. The present Sasta temples stationed at the entrance to these passes were the temples of Siva originally established by the Asura armies for their worship. Even the "Keralolpathi" acknowledges that these Sasta temples were instituted for the purpose of preventing the influx of the Aryan Brahmans from the plains. All these facts more than bear out the truth of my statement that the country described as Pathala in the Puranas is the country of the Malabar coast.

The long absence of the male members from home for defending their country and upholding their tradition led in due course to a system of matriarchal government of properties among these warlike

Asuras which had developed into the Marumakkathayam law after the entire annihilation of the Asura forces in the battle of Lanka.

We find Malabar to be the seat of all sorts of Anacharas or absurd customs which are found in no other part of the world and which are even to this day puzzling the inquisitive minds of antiquarians. How can we explain the existence of these abnormal and absurd customs except that they are the remnants of the customs and manners of those primitive but powerful Rakshasas whose descendants took refuge in this country, untroubled and uninterfered with by foreign influence for centuries and ages?

Now I have explained to you the common origin of the Rakshasas and the Kashatrias. It is my duty to prove that the commonly accepted theory that the Kshatrias were Aryans, who entered India along with the Brahmans, is a mistake. The surest test of kinship is inter-marriage. The very fact that there were from the beginning no intermarriages between the Brahmans and the Kshatrias proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that they belonged either to two distinct races or at least to two different branches of the same race. If inter-marriage was current before the time of Manu, none of the Manus or no amount of legislation could have been able to check it. In fact legislation prohibiting intermarriage would have been simply impossible. Again the Vedic Brahmans never worshipped Siva. The name of Siva is not even mentioned in the oldest parts of the Vedas. The contempt in which this deity was held by the Brahmans may be seen from the fact the they even to this day do not partake of the food placed at the altar of Siva. The reason alleged for this attitude of the Brahmans is that Siva was a Brahman killer. What does this mean? If it means anything at all it is that Siva was God of another religion entirely opposed to and subversive of Brahmanism. Having done with the historical aspect ofthe Ramayana, let me tell you something about its moral, religious and literary aspects. To show the moral purpose of the Ramayana I need only point out to you the various aspects in which the several characters in it are delineated. The person of Sri Rama is always held out as the highest type of man. Whether as a son or pupil, or as a brother or friend, or as husband or father, or as an ally or enemy, or as a king or sage in whatever aspects he is viewed, the figure of Sri Rama stands out pre-eminently as among the highest ideals of humanity. Coming to the character of Sita, she is held out as the highest ideal of womanhood. In spite of being placed in adverse circum-

stances, in spite of being exposed to imminent dangers, and at the sight of death, she preserves her equanimity of temper and is never swayed by any other consideration than firm devotion to her lord. As to the character of Bharata, Lakshmana and Satrughna each of them excels the other in their devotion to their brother. I shall close this aspect of the Ramayana with a quotation. When Bharata finds out in the forests Sri Rama and compels him to return home, these are the words that formed his answer :—

"There is nothing greater than truth and truth should be esteemed the most esteemed of all things. The Vedas have their sole foundation on truth. Having promised obedience to my father's commands I will never through covetousness or forgetfulness or blind ignorance break down the barrier of truth".

Closely wound up with the ethical is the religious aspect of the Ramayana. Sri Rama its hero is described as an incarnation of Vishnu. Of the three manifestations of the Supreme Being called Brahma Vishnu and Siva, Vishnu is described as the preserver of the universe; and as such he is said to assume flesh and blood whenever he finds that the world is going in the direction of destruction. The object of incarnation is beautifully described by Sri Krishna in two slokas which he addresses to his friend and disciple Arjuna. "When virtue fades and vices reign, I assume flesh and blood in order to save the righteous and to punish the wicked. I create myself in every age for the establishment of Dharma or duty." With this object in view Vishnu had in the past assumed various forms of creation in various ages corresponding to the various stages of the growth of prakriti or the evolution of nature.

After incarnating himself in minor types as protozoa, radiata, mollusca and arthrozoa, he had finally assumed vertebral form in the shape of fish. This Avatara is called the Matsyavatara. Next he incarnated as a tortoise i. e. half-fish and half-reptile. This avatara is called the Kurmavatara. The next Avatara was that of Anantha the Sarpavatara. Next came the Garuda Avatara or the Avatara as bird. Next in order was the Avatara of quadruped and this Avatara was called the Varahavatara. Next came the Avatara of Narasimha, half-man and half-beast. Next in order was the Vamana or the diminutive man. Then came the Sri Ramavatara or the Avatara of the ideal man, who first introduced into the world, by his precept and example, the doctrine of duty and virtue. But the light that was brought into the world by Sri Rama was soon dimmed; and

another avatar was necessitated to inculcate the doctrine of duty once more, and this avatar was called the Krishnavatara.

From the foregoing facts you will find that the object of the incarnation of Sri Rama was to introduce into the world the doctrine of duty and virtue. But the human mind hardened by the temptation of the external world thwarted the doctrine which had again and again to be inculcated and re-inculcated by such famous *loka* gurus as Sri Krishna, Buddha and Christ. It is the doings of the ideal man Sri Rama, the doings of the man who first introduced into the world the highest ideal of duty, that is treated of in the Ramayana. Hence it is no wonder that this book is prized by the Hindus as their Bible.

All honour therefore is due to its author Valmiki and the best way of honouring him is to study his works.

P. V. NANOO PILLAI.

THE NATIONALISATION OF LAND.

BY MR. K. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

"Rent of land is a very familiar expression. In popular language it is defined as the remuneration which the land-owning class receives for the use of the native and indestructible powers of the soil. But in the language of the Science of Economics rent which any land will yield, is the excess of its produce, beyond what would be returned to the same capital if employed on the worst land in cultivation. This requires a word of explanation. Let us suppose that in a country there are three grades of land with varying degrees of fertility These three grades we will denote by the letters A, B, & C, A being the most fertile, B being the second in order and C the last or the least fertile. The return from these three grades of land to the same capital will vary according to the fertility, A yielding the most and C the least. We cannot expect when a country is occupied that every kind of soil will be immediately taken up for cultivation. The natural instinct of man will lead him on to the occupation of the most fertile parts of the country at first. So in the country which we have taken up for illustration the soil A will be chosen first for cultivation. Now as long as cultivation is confined to plot A and everybody could get as much of it as he likes, A will yield no rent to the landlord or if at all only a nominal rent which may be neglected for the purposes of our subject. But owing to reasons which will be referred to later on, in course of time, B will also have to be taken up for cultivation. Then A will begin to bear a rent and the amount of that rent will be the excess of produce of A over that of B for the applicatian of the same amount of capital. But at this stage of cultivation B will not bear any rent. But as time advances, owing to insufficiency of food due to the growth of the community C will also have to be brought under cultivation. Then B will also begin to yield a rent and the rent of A will be enhanced; because the rent of B will be the excess of its return over that of C to the application of the same capital. The rent of A being now its excess over the produce of C it will be naturally enhanced. Let us take a concrete example. Let us suppose an acre of land in plot A would yield ten bushels of wheat, B eight and C six. When A and B alone are cultivated the rent of A would

be (10—8) or 2 bushels per acre. When C is also brought under cultivation the rent of A will be (10-6) or 4 bushels per acre and that of B will be (8-6) or 2 bushels per acre. Now C will not bear any rent. If there are inferior grades of soil, inferior to C they will also in course of time be brought under cultivation until we come to the soil which will just pay the expenses of cultivation. This theory of rent is known as Ricardo's theory of rent, Ricardo being the economist who first formulated it in a scientific form. Now, two causes mainly tend to drive down cultivation to lower and lower grades of soil. Growth of population and civilisation which tends to create an increased demand for material comforts. The name of Malthus is familiar to every one as the discoverer of the principle of population. His book on the principle of population published about the close of the 18th century marks an epoch in the science of political economy. According to him population always presses against the limits of subsistence. There is a constant tendency to increase beyond the limits of subsistence and if unchecked population would double itself in twenty-five years, the increase being in a geometrical ratio. "Through the animal and vegetable kingdoms nature has scattered the seeds of life abroad with the most profuse and liberal hand; but has been comparatively sparing in the room and the nourishment necessary to rear them. The germs of existence contained in this earth, if they could freely develop themselves, would fill millions of worlds in the course of a few thousand years. Necessarily that imperious all-pervading law of nature restrains them within the prescribed bounds. The race of plants and the race of animals shrink under this great restrictive law; and man cannot by any efforts of reason escape from it." This tendency of population to increase beyond the limits of subsistence increases the demand for land.

Again the progress of society in the scale of modern civilisation has created a demand for material comforts the satisfaction of which requires the production of raw materials. These causes viz., increase of population and civilisation tend to enhance the demand for land. Cultivation therefore is driven down to more and more inferior grades of soil or soils more distant from the market. The obvious result of this is to increase the rent of land. If it is the bringing under cultivation of the lower grades of soil is what increases rent, it may be asked why not cultivate the same soil more intensely with the application of more capital. But here the law of diminishing returns intervenes and prevents the further application. This law is best

stated in the language of John Stuart Mill: "The limitation to production from the properties of the soil, is not like the obstacle opposed by a wall, which stands inmoveable in one particular spot and offers no hindrance to motion short of stopping it entirely. We may rather compare it to a highly elastic and extensible band, which is hardly ever so violently stretched, that it could not possibly be stretched any more, yet the pressure of which is felt long before the final limit is reached. After a certain and very advanced stage in the progress of agriculture, it is the law of production from the land, that in any given state of agriculture, skill and knowledge, by increasing the labour, the produce is not increased in an equal degree, doubling the labour does not double the produce". Mr. Marshall says "Making use of a term suggested by James Mill, we may regard the capital and labour applied to land as consisting of equal successive doses. As we have seen, the return to the first few doses may perhaps be small and a greater number of doses may get a larger proportionate return; the return to successive doses may even in exceptional cases alternatively rise and fall. But our law states that sooner or later a point will be reached after which all further doses will obtain a less proportionate return than the preceding doses. The dose which only just remunerates the cultivator may be said to be the marginal dose and the return to it the marginal return". This tendency to a diminishing return, says Mr. Marshall, was the cause of most of the migrations of which history tells. Wherever the right to cultivate land is much in request we may be sure the tendency to a diminishing return is in full operation. Were it not for this tendency every farmer could save nearly the whole of his rent by giving up all but a small portion of his land and bestowing all his capital and labour on that.

Thus we see that capital and labour could not be bestowed upon the same land beyond the margin of cultivation and hence the necessity for going in search of new lands. As inferior and inferior grades of soil are thus brought under cultivation the rent of land is proportionately increased. The landlord thus gets the increase of rent due to the increase of the community and the tenant is kept down to the lower level at which he is just remunerated for the capital he invests. The landlord has done nothing to enhance the value of his land. He has not improved it and has not bestowed any capital and labour upon it, still year after year his rent is increased while at the same time the profits of the cultivator are by that amount decreased. This increase of

rent due to no exertion on the part of the landlord is for that reason called in political science the "unearned increment" because it is obvious that the landlord has not earned it by his labour or skill. What claim have these landlords to increments which they have not earned asks the poor man. Why should they any more than the poor get them? This question has been agitating the minds of economists since David Ricardo enunciated the law of rent. This question was brought into greater prominence by the growing poverty of the agricultural classes. Mr. Mill therefore suggested that individual ownership of land should be abolished and the land should belong to the state or nation. The unearned increment should go to enrich the coffers of the state and should be utilised for administrative purposes and thereby relieve the poor of a great part of their burden. The cultivator should have only a tenant's right in the land of the country. This theory is known as "the nationalisation of land". Although the credit of having suggested it for the first time belongs to Mr. Mill the most violent exponent of this theory is Henry George, an American writer, who in his book on "Progress and Poverty" denounced in the strongest terms possible the individual ownership of land. According to Mr. George besides the increase of population every progress of society increased demand for land and increase of rent. The improvement of the arts of production, the growth of manufactures, the invention of labour-saving machinery all tended to increase the demand for land, to the increase of rent and the consequent impoverishment of the cultivating classes. According to him therefore progress of society involved the increased poverty and hence the significance of the name of his book, "Progress and Poverty". No doubt this is an extreme position to take and it is not free from fallacies. But it cannot be denied there is much logic and force in his arguments. Mr. Mill and Mr. George agree in the remedy they suggest viz, the nationalisation of land but in their methods or *modus operandi* there is a wide divergence. While Mr. Mill would compensate the existing landowners who have purchased the land at the capitalised value of the rent, Mr. Henry George would recognise no such distinction but would compulsorily drive out every land owner whether he obtained his ownership by the accident of birth or whether he is one who paid heavily for his purchase. No doubt Mr. George has got his own reasons for this apparently wild suggestion. As a partial recognition of this scheme of the land nationalisation some Governments have adopted the system of levying land-tax whereby they assume that the rent or unearned increment is with

drawn from the landlord and credited to the national exchequer. This is so notably in India and it has therefore given rise to the great controversy "tax or rent". The Government maintains that the revenue they derive from the land is only the rent or the unearned increment but Indian economists say that it is more than the rent and it taxes also the profits of the capitalist or cultivator. The major portion of the burden is, argues the Indian publicist, borne by the capitalist cultivator and not the landlord. The difficulty of determining the portion of the yield which would go to the landlord as rent coupled with the unscrupulousness of the settlement or assessing officers, the Indian cultivator is deprived of a large portion of his profits in the name of rent. "The Indian cultivators therefore were simply existing on the land, and for their few clothes, medicines and family festivals they were trying to get outside work, selling their family bangles, or appealing to the money lender on the offchance that a "bumper crop" might enable them to pay something some day". But the question is asked by Government apologists why should they cultivate at all, when obviously by abandoning the land and its profitless cultivation they could at once better their position by devoting to other work the time and labour they now expend on cultivation. The answer cannot be better given than in the words of Mr. H. W. Nevinson. He says "The question is worthy of the old professorial economists, who never went beyond books for knowledge, and settled the affairs of human nature in their studies by their own conception of reason. They used to tell us that when one trade failed the labour devoted to it became absorbed in other occupations. I have often wondered, if their trade of theorizing failed, in what other occupation their labour would become absorbed. A large number of our Indian officials spend nearly the whole of their time dealing with abstractions and cases on paper, their feet being under their writing tables. The increasing pressure of the daily routine drives them further and further from reality. The Indian cultivator will cling to his land even when he makes no profit beyond his subsistence wage. I believe the same to be true of peasant proprietors or small holders in nearly every country; certainly it is true in France, Russia, and Ireland for I have known cases in all these three countries. So the Indian cultivator, when he makes no profit and is called upon for increased assessment or his daughter's, marriage does not set off to Bombay and become a watch-maker or docker as economists think he ought. As I said he borrows. Usually he goes to the village money-lender and receives advances at 12 to 30

per cent per annum according to his character in the village. In reality I think, the money-lender speculates on the chance of a "bumper crop" every few years; but in the last resort he may sell up the cultivator through the Civil Courts or convert him into his own labourer to work the land for him on a subsistence wage". But this is a digression and I am fearfully trenching upon controversial grounds. The system adopted by the Indian Government is, as I have shown, a partial land nationalisation system but owing to various reasons such as absence of freedom and national control over the methods of assessment, the ignorance and corruption of settlement officers it works great hardship upon the ryot. Every beneficent human institution is liable to be abused and this is no exception to the general rule. The nationalisation of land is the main plank of the Socialist platform in European countries. In England it is pressed more and more into prominence in practical politics by the growing influence of Socialist and Labour members in Parliament—Mr. Lloyd George's budget for 1910 contains a proposal to tax undeveloped land and building sites and great controversy is now raging over it. Mr. Lloyd George's proposals are (1):—To tax the owner of land the value of which has risen through the enterprise of the community or neighbours to the extent of $\frac{1}{5}$ of the "strictly unearned increment", starting from the value at the present moment. The tax will be payable when the land is sold. Corporations will pay at stated intervals. (2) A tax of $\frac{1}{2}$ d in the £ will be imposed on the capital value of land "not used to the best advantage," including mineral land. It is to be charged on unbuilt land only. (3) A 10% "reversion duty is to be imposed on benefits derived from the determination of leases. Special abatements will be made in certain cases. The objection to taxing this unearned increment is mainly that it is unjust to the person who invests his money in land and it hampers free purchase of land. "Every other owner of property is allowed to enjoy any enhancement of its value that may occur from any cause whatever. If he has industrial shares or pictures or a grocery business or anything that gains in value from changes in fashions, or movement of population, or any other cause over which he has no control, he keeps that enhancement for himself as a matter of course. But, if he has put his money into land, then any increase in value not demonstrably due to his own exertions is regarded as a thing which does not belong to him at all. For this kind of differentiation there is nothing

to be said. There is no equity or fair dealing in confiscating unearned increment upon one kind of property and no other. There is some sort of confused notion in men's minds that the increased value of land is due in a peculiar manner to the community at large. What does the community do to make a field more valuable than before? The community does not lay out a penny, but its members compete with one another for possession of building lots in that field. They make the increased value simply by being there, and in precisely the same way every value is what it is by reason of the community being there. Take away the community, and every thing from the masterpiece of Holbien, down to the goodwill of the Cobbler's little business, drops indefinitely in value. No greater Will-o-the-Wisp ever deluded sane people than this attempt to separate the increment due to the mere existence of society. It cannot be done all round; and it is mere injustice to attempt it in the case of land alone. Even then it can not be done impartially all round as Mr. Lloyd George is practically compelled to admit by exempting reversions, in which a numerous class is interested." Now I have stated the proposal and objection to it from the opposition as briefly as possible. As regards the objection any one can easily see that enhancement of value of other kinds of property is not taxed is no excuse for not removing a long standing stigma against the unearned increment of land. Besides it is not necessarily true that industrial shares and other kinds of property increase in value owing to the same causes that tend to increase the value of land. For instance a share in a gold mining company might increase in value owing to the richness of the mine and the dividend it is able to pay to the shareholders. The Kolar Gold Fields for instance pay more than a hundred p. c. dividend and consequently the value of shares in it has increased. But in the case of other lands the land has not increased in value because it is able to pay a higher dividend to the capitalists but because the community has increased in numbers and has set up greater competition. To this increase the landlord has no right but it should belong to the community. This is what the advocates of the land nationalisation scheme propose and what Mr. Lloyd George is endeavouring to carry out though on a very small scale. The Socialist and Labour members have greeted the budget with great enthusiasm. The Socialists say that Mr. Lloyd George's budget takes from the rich to give to the poor—It is feared that the opposition to the Budget is so great that the Government might suffer a shipwreck upon it. But

whatever the fate of the present Government, whatever the oppositions to the proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it indicates unmistakably the direction in which the wind blows and the scheme is bound to be realised in the fullness of time. The old order of land monopoly, at any rate, must give place to the new and the fulfilment is bound to come lest this custom should corrupt the world."

K. PARAMESWARAN PILLAI.

THE MORALITY OF THE RAMAYANA,—A REJOINDER.

BY MR. T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI, M. R. A. S.

IN preparing my paper on the *Morality of the Ramayana*, I intended to interpret the views of the late Professor Sundaram Pillai, to a larger circle of readers than the *Tamilian Antiquary* was able to command, in order to elicit rational criticism, in the interests of the South Indian History. As education advances it is but natural that investigations into the history of one's own land, particularly if it is enveloped in mystery, should be made. At all events, such a spirit pervades at present the minds of all educated men both in Southern India and Ceylon, where most of the scenes in the Ramayana have been laid. If in the course of such a legitimate enquiry old ideas are exploded, all right-thinking people ought to welcome such a healthy change, and sympathise with the workers in their difficult labours. In the place of such generous treatment, I least expected a furious, but, a pointless attack, from the pen of Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, the talented Chief Justice of Travancore, who is known for his perfect equanimity of temper, and who until now never permitted it to be ruffled by anything, as became an arbiter of justice in the Highest Court of the kingdom. I also regret, that in the heat of the fight he should have so forgotten himself as to introduce into the arena of discussion a large number of unparliamentary expressions (about 40 in number besides unlimited inuendoes) thus following the vernacular controversies he has condemned* after taking exception to my using certain strong terms; and as a crowning act, that he should have suggested, that some evil spirit, probably from the nether world, impelled me to set my pen to the article in question.

What I regret more than anything, is, his reference to my motives, and the introduction of politics into the review of my paper. In the first place, it is hard that I should be denounced, as attacking a class, if in the course of making a statement of certain historical facts, it is placed in an unfavourable light. In the next place, it was in no light-hearted mood, or with the object of ridiculing the worship of Rama, that I penned the article which Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar criticises. I should perhaps have added the warning

* Vide end of page 209, *The Malabar Quarterly Review* Vol VIII.

with which Mr. V. P. Subramania Mudaliar, the author of the Tamil version prefaced it, viz., that it was only an historical aspect of the question.

It is however gratifying to me that my reviewer credits me with the Saiva Siddhantha faith. The broad and cosmopolitan principles which it inculcates are embodied in the following stanza of the *Kanda Purana* :—

"எவ்வெவர்தம்மையேனும், யாவரேயெனினும்போற்றி
அவ்வவரிடமாக்கொண்டே, யவர்க்கருடருவாய்போற்றி
மெய்வருதெளிவிலுன்னை, வெளிப்படஉணர்ந்துளோர்க்குத்
தெய்வதபோகமுத்தி, சிறப்பொடுதருவாய்போற்றி"

—கந்தபுராணம்-தக்ஷகாண்டம், கந்தவிரதப்படலம்—65.

"நாற்குலச்சாதி யிந்நாட்டில் கீர்நாட்டினீர்"

—கபிலர் அகவல்

"Whosoever may worship Thee in whatsoever aspect, Thou wilt "present Thyself as such, and grant him grace. To those that "understand Thee aright, Thou wouldst grant beatitude gracefully. "I adore such a Deity."

If I adhere to these views, and I assure my readers that I do, I cannot consistently trifle with the faith inculcated in the Ramayana, and will not directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously, indulge in such a treatment as that with which I have been fathered by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar; though it is a difficult thing to question the absurdities and supernaturalisms that have been smuggled into it by some of its deluded votaries.

To construct a reliable history of Southern India constant reference has to be made to Ramayana—one of the few sources of ancient record. But dealing as it does, with hoary antiquity, garbed as the facts are in our inherent national hyperbole, drawn as the imageries are in such a way as to border upon mythology, and unrestrained as the chroniclers are in their indulgence to the fullest extent in the license which poetry permits, it should be the endeavour of every sane man to allow the facts to be treated as historical truths, to be put to a crucial scientific test. It is my humble, but my firm belief, that this test consists in courting healthy and open crticism of of all doubtful facts. This is an experience, not at all foreign to my critic, who had large experience as a Judicial Officer. In performing this task, if I am charged with the offence of disturbing the established faith, my reply is that the end justifies the means.

Now as to politics. I repeat that I regret the introduction of this subject into the discussion. I have always had a natural disinclination to discuss it, and the unfortunate condition of India at the present moment makes any reference to the topic unsavory. If I am compelled to enter the lists, Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar alone is responsible for my doing so. In the course of his criticism, he says that the delay in the introduction of Lord Morley's reforms is due to the conduct of people like my humble self. But as is evident from the published reports, it is due to that generous spirit which prompted the benign British Government to launch the whole scheme. Here I must digress for a moment to explain myself and to enable Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar to refresh his memory in the study of ancient history.

It was only when the Aryans first crossed the Indus and the frontiers of Provinces in Northern India, which had established Governments, that they had to encounter stout opposition from the races that had already settled themselves down there. In the course of time, they were able to live in peace with them, and as time advanced, both the races became indentified with each other. In this stage of society a person was a Brahmin by reason of his learning and the practice of his virtues, or, to say with Brihu, "In whomsoever are seen truthfulness, kindliness. charity, harmlessness, feeling of shame and thoughtfulness, he is known or styled in society as a Brahmin." Thus it is evident, that a person was not a Brahmin by the mere accident of his birth, but he had to earn the position; such men of culture and austerity were in requisition in the councils of state and the community was freely drawn upon to furnish them. Things moved satisfactorily till some ambitious and designing individuals, took it into their heads to create hereditary rights, that their progeny might be benefitted.* It was then that the class of Brahmins came into undue prominence. Under the cloak of exercising their rights, they created social distinctions, taking advantage of the different

* We are sorry that we have to differ from Mr. T. Ponnambalam Pillai in his view of explaining the Brahmin predominance as the result of the work of "designing individuals" and in his endeavour to traduce the Brahmin class as whole which may have its own black sheep as any other classes in our midst. It would be more scientific to ascribe the high status and influence of the Brahmin to his inherent superiority, taken all round, over the members of the other classes with whom he has been brought into contact in India. It is only another phase of the "Survival of the Fittest". No amount of zeal for the Dravidian-culture should blind us to the deep debt Oriental civilization owes to our Aryan brethren. We deplore very much that in the discussion of a legitimate historical question the parties have introduced matters calculated only to create bad blood among the two important branches of South Indian Society.—Ed. *M. Q. R.*

professions, kept those below them in ignorance, and ground them down, calling to their aid the legislatures of the country, which were ready to obey their every behest and call, practising all manner of tyranny that ingenuity could devise, while taking care to preach to the world the inutility and mutability of all things mundane. The inception and origin of the Code of Manu, which though called Dharma Sastra should in reality be called Adharma Sastra or unjust laws, are due to causes and times like these. This system of arbitrary oligarchic Government continued till the great Sage Buddha rose, stopped all inhuman practices and established universal brotherhood. But the influence of his teachings was not to last long in India, though a third of the human race was captivated by them. The Brahmins again had the upper hand and wielded their Code of Manu and other engines of inhumanity with redoubled vigour. During the Mahomedan occupation of the country these rulers, excepting Akbar, had no time or mind to devote to the amelioration of the subject population, and the Brahmins held tight the social noose, they had thrown round the inferior classes, for, they had many opportunities to hold responsible positions in the state, owing to their great hereditary learning. With the advent of the British rule there was a relaxation of the rigour of this hold, but it was not possible all at once for the new Governors to free the people from the thraldom of sacerdotalism. For, as a natural sequence to the monopoly of all learning, intelligence was inherited only by that class, and when the generous British Government was prepared to accept the services of the sons of the soil, they were compelled to employ largely members of the Brahmin class. The moment they were placed in offices of trust and responsibility, they surrounded themselves with their kith and kin. This system of nepotism was carried to such an extent that the European officials, particularly the Collectors of Districts, had actively to take steps to minimise the introduction of the Brahmin element. I must here exonerate the Maharatta Brahmins, who treated all classes alike. In the face of this bitter experience, if the system of election to the Councils by the Municipalities and Local Fund Boards, which has just been done away with, were to be continued, it can be safely predicted that that class which has done the greatest injury to India, would form the majority in the reformed Councils and "bring back Manu's Code in full force."

I have up to this spoken only of the classes, who could approach

the Brahmins without contamintion and maintain intercourse with them. There are classes, for whose depressed condition they and they alone are responsible, and if the system referred to above were to continue, their condition would be worse still. The dialogue between the Pariah Saint Nandan, and his Brahmin Lord when the former sought permission to visit the shrine at Chidambaram for Divine worship, but was refused permission on the ground that his caste precluded him from doing so, illustrates the existing feeling amongst the greater part of the Brahmin community, notwithstanding the futile and unpractical attempts that have been made by some nobler souls amongst them, to improve their condition.

An impartial European gentleman, who spent years amongst the Indians in Southern India, speaks as follows of the Brahmins and non-Brahmins.

"The Brahmin has seized and reigned over the whole country from Himalaya to Kumari (Comorin): he has converted the million masses of Dravidians to accept at least in name Hinduism as their religion."

"Five-sixths of the graduates turned out by the Madras University are Brahmins, while all the rest of the Presidency including Sudras, Muslims and Christians together make up the remaining one-sixth. The Brahmin believes himself to be the embodiment of God on earth, he therefore sees no unfairness in gaining power purely to serve his own interests; he sees no h[illegible] in treating as vassals nearly 200 million of non-Brahmin Hindoos, or scorning as enemies, the sixty two millions of Mahomedans; and he sees no injustice in grinding down the 50 million of out-castes who are lower than the cows and dogs, and whose very shadow pollutes him."

"The Brahmins have the advantage of English as naturalised Indians by many a century, but both they and their religion are just as "foreign" as the English with their Christianity. By priestcraft and sheer weight of intellect, they are the heriditary lords and rulers of India; as undisputed sovereigns they sank into a deadly lethargy, and now, after the lapse of ages they have aroused out of their sleep, and they naturally resent our presence. The Sudras, however, have not yet as a class been touched, either like the Brahmins, by the electric shock of contact with the West or, like the Panchamas, by the startling revelation of equality in the Christian brotherhood. Their day has not yet dawned but dawn it soon must. Though the doors and windows both of their minds and souls are

still closed and barred, the light is streaming in by a thousand little chinks and crannies. They will soon see things as they are; and when the sun has fully risen, the real awakening of India will begin, an awakening such as the world has never seen before and probably never will see again except in the neighbouring continent of China. The Panchamas have been touched by Christianity, though practically not at all by education, but the day is not far off when they and the millions of Dravidians will refuse to follow the Aryan lead either in the matter of religion or politics."*

In the face of these facts, it is nothing but right that our Mahomedan fellow subjects should seek an electorate independent of the Hindu Community and that Parsees, Panchamas and Native Christians should necessarily lay claim to similar privilege. Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar need not be under the impression that the other non-brahmin classes are satisfied with the representation of their interests by the members of his community. A feeling of dissatisfaction has been smouldering in their hearts, but has not burst out into a flame for want of sufficient number of leaders among them. The paternal and benign Government was therefore justified in taking time to consider how to safeguard the interests of the dumb-millions. After this elucidation I trust that Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar will see how the delay in the introduction of Lord Morley's reforms has occurred.

Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar appears to speak [illegible]tingly of the Dravidians, and the Vellalas in particular, as [illegible]ng to the same race to which Hanuman belonged, or at least from which one of his parents descended. My friends and myself are prepared to accept the honor, and even go to the length of claiming relationship with the Rakshathas, but not the theory of mongrel origin, as it is against the law of nature and physiologically impossible. Whatever may be the views held of the descent of the Dravidians, I may mention with pardonable pride, that they not only fought under the flag of Rama of yore, but also under that of our present Rulers against overwhelming odds. For, it is a known historical fact, that when Clive and Hastings were hard-pressed, they stood by them manfully, making immense sacrifices. Again when the great mutiny broke out and the Aryans rebelled against the established authority, the Dravidian regiments were pre-eminent in their unwavering loyalty to it. ‡

* Vide the article "what the Brahmins have done" by the Rev. J. H. Sharrock in the September issue of the *Nineteenth Century*.

‡ Vide page 292, *Vedic India*.

I think I should make one more preliminary observation, before proceeding to the discussion of the main subject, in order to correct what I may term a historical solecism. Towards the end of page 213 of the *Malabar Quarterly Review* Vol. VIII, Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar speaks in a patronising tone saying that certain Dravidian friends of his ought to be counted as Brahmins and Kshatrias and I believe if he had the power he would have raised them to that dignity. He further adds (vide page 214, *M. Q. R.* Vol VIII) that there is a large infusion of Aryan blood amongst the Dravidians, but failed to state the reverse. It has already been pointed out that when the Aryans entered Northern India they did so as conquerors and not as peaceful emigrants, though at a later stage they became identified with the races already in possession of the land. But it was the other day when they entered Southern India, and they were enabled to do so only by the sufferance of the Dravidians. I make this statement on the authority of Ramayana itself. During his exile, when Rama travelled from place to place he took care to ascertain, where to get lodgings for himself and his two relations from friendly people, and how to protect themselves from man and beast.† Again the fact that Agastia, the sage, was constantly subject to attacks from such individuals, as Sutha, the husband of Tadaka, Tadaka herself, and her son Mareesa (Canto 25, Balakandam), that the sages at Chitrakuda had to abandon their dwellings owing to the illtreatment of Kara of Janasthana, that Rama was able only to hear their complaints and sympathise with them (canto 116, Ayodyakandam) and that he had clandestinely to make an alliance with Sugriva at the Rishyamuka Ranges, while Vali more powerful than Ravana was holding undisputed sway over Kishkintha (Canto 10, Kishkinthakandam), go to show that that the Aryans were dependent upon the pleasure of, and seekers of favor from, the permanent dwellers of the soil. In these circumstances, they would only have been too glad to enter into close relationship with the all-powerful natives. Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar makes a serious admission. For towards the end of page 213 of the Review he says "that many conquered and indigenous races belonging to an earlier civilization must of course have been taken into Aryan caste system. Some of the more enlightened and religious members belonging to such indigenous races, were incorporated as even Kshatrias and Vysias"; and I ask why not as Bramins?

† Vide Canto 54, *Ayodhyakandam.*

The statement made by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar is an historical truth, as the result of the evolution of the society when an immigrant people mix with a resident population. It has been authoritatively established that the Dravidians were not the indigenous races of Southern India. They belong to an earlier wave of immigration, and in all probability, the first batch of them crossed over by sea from Western Asia, as is evident from their skill as sailors. Notwithstanding the nicknames of giants and monkeys given to them by the Aryans, the description given in the Ramayana of their cities and buildings, the high standard of morality observed by the generality of them, and the state of efficiency and discipline in which their armies were maintained, go to show the high level of civilization attained by them. This was their condition when the Aryans crossed the Indus (vide *Vedic India*, page 291). After centuries when they advanced towards the south, though there were the usual bickerings in the beginning, both the races became reconciled to each other, and identified with one another, so as to form a single nation. From what has fallen from Kapilar, a poet of the last Academy at Madura, it seems that the caste system was introduced into Southern India at a late stage. Addressing the Aryans in his famous Agaval, he bitterly complains of it and says:—

"You established the system of four castes in this country"

From the above it is evident that both the races were fused together into one, and subsequently the division of caste was initiated. In that case the Dravidians must have become not only Kshatrias and Vysias, but also Brahmins, as was the case with the non-Aryan Indians of Northern India like Viswamithra, Vyasa and Valmiki. There are modern parallels to this historic fact in other parts of the world, and mention may be made of the case of the Boers and British settlers in South Africa. From these facts, it is patent that not only Aryan blood flows freely in the veins of the Dravidians, but the reverse is also the case. I cannot but observe here that I was compelled to discuss this question at this length by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, and in doing so, I have not intended offence to any body. I therefore trust that my Brahmin friends, who are many and Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar the Facile Princeps amongst them, will not mistake me.

Before entering upon the main question, I must at the outset point out that when I penned my article on the Ramayana, I had expressly stated that I had given an English garb to the ideas of Professor Sundaram Pillai as clothed in Tamil by my friend Mr. V. P. Subramania Mudaliar. As the late professor and myself

have since been taken to task, I propose to accept all responsibility, and with the assistance of Mr. Subramania Mudaliar to meet, as much as it lies in our power, the attack conceived and levelled in an unfair and illiberal spirit by my critic, though not with that clearness of thought and felicity of diction, which characterised the writings of the late Mr. Sundaram Pillai.

It has been admitted on all hands that the late lamented professor was a profound scholar, an archaeologist and a thinker of no mean order. If therefore on a set of given facts he arrived at a conclusion, which satisfies any reasonable mind, it is hard to find fault with him. With regard to his want of faith in the Ramayana, it continued up to the day of his death, as will be seen from the introduction to the *Tamilian Antiquary* No. 2 by Mr. J. M. Nallaswamy Pillai, B. A., B. L. (Vide page 1). I may also state here, that in this disbelief he stood in good company, for Mr. R. C. Dutt, whose recent irreparable loss is mourned throughout the length and breadth of India, whose right to fame as a scholar and savant of European reputation is greater than that of Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar and whose admiration for the sublime portions of the Ramayana is second to none, has delivered himself as follows.

"Like the Mahabaratha, the Ramayana is utterly valueless as a narrative of historical events and incidents. As in the Mahabaratha, so in the Ramayana, the heroes are myths pure and simple."

"Sita, the field furrow had received divine honours from the time of the Rig Veda, and had been worshipped as a Goddess. When cultivation gradually spread in Southern India, it was not difficult to invent a political myth, that Sita was carried to the south. And when she is Goddess and woman—the noblest creation of human imagination,—had acquired a distinct and lovely individuality, she was naturally described as the daughter of the holiest and most learned king on record, Janaka of the Videhas."

"But who is Rama, described in the epic as Sita's husband and the king of the Kosalas? The later Puranas tell us that he was an incarnation of Vishnu, but Vishnu himself had not risen to prominence at the time of which we are speaking. Indra was still the chief of the Gods of the epic period. And in the Sutra literature (e. g. Paraskara Grihya Sutra II, 17, 9) we learn that Sita, the furrow Goddess, is the wife of Indra. Is it then an untenable conjecture that Rama, the hero of the Ramayana, is in his original

conception, like Arjuna the hero of the Mahabaratha, only a new edition of Indra battling with the demons of drought. The myth of Indra has thus been mixed up with the epic which describes as a historic war in Northern India, and with the epic which describes the historic conquest of Southern India."*

As the morality of the Ramayana rests chiefly on the conduct of the leading Aryan heroes and their confederates, I have touched on the following points in my first article, though incidentally minor questions have been discussed.

(1) The conduct of Vali or Bali and Sugriva towards each other and their character.

(2) The nature of the alliance between the latter and Rama.

(3) The conduct of Ravana and Vibhishna towards each other and their character.

(4) The nature of the alliance between the latter and Rama.

(5) The existence of the beings called Rakshathas, Asurars, Devas and Vanaras.

Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, who has discovered in my paper an attack levelled against his class and has therefore taken up the gauntlet on their behalf, begins by stating that he does not propose to refute my arguments in detail. The reason assigned for this omission is the want of time—a subterfuge generally adopted by less subtle beings. To my mind it is impossible to meet some of the questions raised by my friends and the presumption of the omission is no doubt in my favour. He not only passes over most of the points noted above, but altogether refrains from dwelling on the existence or otherwise of the beings called Rakshathas (Giants), Asurars (Demons), Devas (Celestials) and Vanarars (Men with tails), and raises certain side issues such as the relationship between Ravana and Tadaka and the overlorship of Janasthana and Dandakaranya.

One of the gravest charges levelled against us is that we have misrepresented matters by referring to information that does not find a place in the Ramayana of Valmiki. On page 208 of the *Malabar Quarterly Review* Vol. viii, Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar refers to Thulasiram's, Kamban's, and Eluthachan's, and other renderings of the epic. Referring to the same subject, my friend Mr. Subramania Mudaliar says that though Ramayana has been translated into all the Indian languages, whenever a person speaks of it, it is generally supposed to be that of Valmiki (vide p. iii preface No. 2 *Tamilian*

† Dutt's Early Hindu Civilization Vol. I page 138.

Antiquary). It is in that strain we have spoken of it, and as far as I have investigated there is no material difference between the original work and the Ramayana of Kamban with which my friends and myself are familiar. Even granting that there were misquotations, with regard to the particular items referred to by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, I do not think that they have affected in any way the main questions. Notwithstanding the taunts and inuendoes directed at us by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, all right-minded people will agree in thinking that the story of the Aryan Chronicler should be accepted with caution. For, in my first article, I pointed out that it was a partisan account and the object of the thesis was to enhance the reputation of his compeers at the expense of their adversaries. In para 6 of this paper I have advanced some further arguments. To add to these, Valmiki was an apostate from non-aryanism and he took up the cause of his new friends with all the ardour characteristic of a new convert.

With this introduction I shall deal with the various questions at issue. But it will be more convenient to dispose of some of the minor points—particularly the overlordship of Dandakaranya and Janasthana, and the relationship between Ravana and Tadaka,—before dwelling with the main ones, as Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar seems to attach much importance to their determination.

With regard to the first, Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar firmly believes that both provinces were under the suzerainty of the empire of Dasaratha, and in support of the contention quotes Canto V of the Balakandam. In doing so, on page 211 of the *Malabar Quarterly Review*, Vol. VIII, he says, "that the entire land of India belonged to the "Solar Race of kings" and in the following page he adds" that the Ikshvahu's race owned "the whole of the land surrounded by seas." There can be no doubt that Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar intended to convey identically the same meaning by the two extracts under marks of quotation, but the words employed do not import it. The first means that the solar dynasty reigned over the whole of India, while the other means over the whole world. On looking through the metric translation of Valmiki into English by Professor Griffiths, and that of Mr. Natesa Sastry into Tamil prose, I find that the poet meant the whole world. If his words are to be construed ilterally, the undoubted existence of a Chaldean, an Assyrian, a Babylonian, a Persian, an Egyptain, and a Chinese Empire in times of yore must be untrue, and the mythological imageries of a rhapsodist alone,

should be held as true. But I have my doubts as to whether the spirit of the age would permit the whole-sale swallowing of patent absurdities of this kind. At all events, this is the occasion to employ the test which I have submitted to the reader in paras 6 and 18 of this paper, to appraise the value of Valmiki.

There is enough of internal evidence in the Ramayana itself to prove that the Kosala empire did not extend to Southern India, so as to include Dandakaranya and Janasthana. The following are some of the facts which may be urged in support of the contention.

(1) That from the same authority quoted by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar (vide Canto V of Balakandam) Kosala was a small kingdom on the banks of Sarayu.

(2) That Janaka king of Mithila was of the same status as Dasaratha and was not a tributary sovereign (as my critic would have us believe) to the Emperor of India. (vide canto 70 and 71 of Balakandam)

(3) That the abject manner in which Dasaratha in conjunction with the sages, entreated Parasurama not to molest his son Rama on his way back to Ayodhiah after his marriage with Sita, does not show that he was the all-powerful Emperor of India. (Vide Canto 65 Balakandam).

(4) That when Rama, the heir to the throne, passed the confines of Kosala after his exile, he had to receive instructions with regard to the geographical position of the places he had to visit and the people inhabiting them. This ignorance is inexcusable in the future Emperor (vide cantos 54 and 55 Ayodhiyah Kandam and the earlier cantos of Aranyakandam)

(5) The helpless condition in which Rama—the avenger of the wrongs of everybody under the sun—found himself when the sages resident at Chitrakuda complained to him of the illtreatment offered to them by Kara—a cousin of Ravana and chief minister of Surpanaka—sallying forth from his post at Janasthana, and the complacent manner in which he was compelled to witness their departure to a safe retreat at a greater distance (vide canto 166, Ayodhiyah Kandam)

(6) That there was a settled Government at Janasthana coupled with Dandakaranya, at the head of which was Surpanaka with Kara as her chief adviser, and Dushana as Commander-in-chief of an armed force of 14,000 picked men (vide cantos 12 to 30 Aranyakandam and canto 99 Uttarakandam)

(7) That when Akampan and Surpanaka sped to Lanka from Janasthana and reported to Ravan that

"Rama was there to strike and slay
"By him O! King of high estate
"Is Janasthana left desolate."
—Canto 31 Aranyakandam

"Know Rama with his conquering arm
"Has freed the saints, from dread of harm
"Has smitten Janasthana and made
"Asylum safe in Dandaka's shade."
—Canto 33 Aranyakandam

their feeling was that the provinces were subject to the rule of Ravana.

(8) That on being informed of the desolate condition in which Janasthana "that feared no hate of foes" and Dandakaranya were laid, his feeling enquiries, quoted below serve as an index of his sway.

"What fool has dared, already dead
"Strike Janasthana, the general dread?
—Canto 31 Aranyakandam.

Who is this Rama..........what purpose led to Dandaka forest, hard to tread?

—Canto 34, Aranyakandam.

..............................did Rama seek the shade of Janasthna with Indra's aid?

—Canto 31 Aranyakandam.

(9) That in discussing the subject with Mareesa, the great anxiety with which he declaims thus:

"My generous, the bravest of my band
"Are slain by Rama's vigorous hand
"And Janasthana that feared no hate
"Of foes, is rendered desolate
—Canto 31, Aranyakandam

exhibits the sense of his authority.

The foregoing facts prove clearly

(1) That the kingdom of Kosala was limited in extent.

(2) That there were kings of the same status as Dasaratha and they were not tributaries to him, and he could not therefore have been emperor of India.

(3) That Janasthana and Dandakaranya were under the

undisputed sway of Ravana and the least interference from outside exasperated him.

Now let us see whether there is any evidence, outside the Ramayana. It has already been noted that Janaka the father of Sita was the contemporary of Dasaratha. According to historical researches Videhas, Kosalas and Kasis were powerful and civilised kingdoms established east of the Ganges, and Janaka, the ruler of the first-named of them, was the most powerful of all the kings.

"That monarch had not only established his power in the farthest confines of the Hindu dominions in India," but had also started "speculations enquiring" about the "destination of the soul, and the nature of the supreme being," so as to find a permanent place for himself in the Upanishads (vide Dutt's *Early Hindu Civilization* Vol. I Book II Chapter 3). If Dasaratha was a contemporary of Janaka, the latter was certainly a more powerful king, and if an emperor was to be elected the choice would certainly have fallen on him. With regard to the identity of Janaka there is no doubt, for the pedigree given in Canto 71 of the Balakandam makes no mention of any other king of the line by the same name. But the most important fact that has to be determined is the extent of the Hindu Aryan world at the time we are speaking of. From Chapter V of the same volume and book, it is seen that proceeding from the banks of the Indus on the west, the Aryans had settled themselves down in the tracts watered by the Ganges and the Jumna by the year 1000 B. C. and the kingdom referred to above were the newest and the latest of of the Hindu kingdoms. "Beyond this wide tract of Hindu kingdoms lay the whole extent of India yet unexplored or rather unconquered by the Aryans and peopled by various aboriginal tribes. A wide belt of this non-aryan tract surrounding the Hindu world to the east, south and west was becoming known to the Hindus about the close of the epic period. South Behar, Malwa and a portion of the Deccan, the regions to the south of the Rajaputana desert, formed a wide semicircular belt of country as yet not hinduised, but becoming gradually known to the Hindus (Chapter 4 same Book). Thus the limits of the Aryan world did not go beyond the Vindhya Range.

This state of things existed, as I have already pointed out, about 1000. B. C. We must now see when further expansion of the Aryan India was made. Boudhayana who flourished much later, probably

about the sixth century B. C, and who was one of the founders of the Sutra-school, fixes the following boundaries as those of Aryavarta or the country of the Aryans viz.,

North.——————Himalayas.
East.——————Behar.
South.——————Vindhya Ranges.
West——————The Saraswati.

and prescribes a penalty in the form of a sacrifice for the absolution of the sin of crossing them (Boudhayana I 1. 2 as quoted by Dutt Vol. I. page 214)

Thus for religious, more than political reasons, which were subordinated, the limits of Aryan India were not permitted to be extended beyond the Vindhya Mountains.

At the time of invasion of India about the year 327 B. C. by Alexander the Great, Chandraguptha was the most powerful Aryan king and his dominions included most of the portions of Northern India which are at present ruled over by four Lieutenant-Governors and a Chief Commissioner. Portions of Bengal, Orissa and the Central Provinces formed the Calling a kingdom, and south of it was the Andrah kingdom extending up to the banks of the Krishna. Later on when the great Asoka succeeded his father, the son of Chandraguptha, he absorbed all the surrounding territories, but the limits of his empire did not advance further than those of Andrah, for his edict No. II places the Chola, the Pandya and the Chera kingdoms beyond the frontier of the Empire, and they were treated as foreign independent potentates.

Thus, step by step, I have striven to show that the Kosala Empire did not reach that limit claimed by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, at any time; if at such a late period as the middle of the third century B. C., the limit of the territories of a powerful monarch could not have gone beyond the river Krishna, it stands to reacon that at an earlier period when there was no desire for conquest and the chivalrous feats attributed to Rama were mostly in self-defence, Dandakaranya and Janasthana did not form part of the imaginary empire of Dasaratha. I cannot but remark here with greater men than myself that Valmiki was not a contemporary of Rama and in elaboratang a story he had heard from Narada and Brahma, he drew as much as possible from his imagination and was therefore guilty of the sin of anachronism.

With regard to Tadaka there is no doubt that she was originally

a Gandarva woman—a name given by the Aryans to some of the non-aryan races; but, as pointed out by Mr. Sadasiva Aiyar, she latterly embraced the faith of the Rakshathas with her whole family, and became identified with them. According to Valmiki she was the wife of a Yaksha by name Sutha and as he wantonly destroyed the garden of Agastia he was reduced to ashes by him. Enraged at this, she and her son Mareesa repaired to the scene of this catastrophe to wreak vengeance but on their appearence they were cursed to assume the form of Rakshathas. After this event, she went on with her depredations as usual with the women of her class and strength and proved a terror to the sages resorting to the forests of Malasam and Karusam, not far away from the southern banks of the Ganges. Amongst others she molested Visvamithra in the performance of his great sacrifice, The first mission of the youthful Rama was to destroy this giantess (vide cantos 24 and 25 Balakandam). After this event, we next hear of Mareesa in Janasthana in the service of Ravana. As belonging to the class of Rakshathas, Tadaka and Mareesa had community of interest with Ravana and other fellow-Rakshathas. As Tadaka was a princess and a leading member of one of the clans of Rakshathas, it is but natural that her death by the hand of Rama must have been working in the mind of Ravana, and if he had taken any steps to avenge it it would have been justifiable. The Tamil poet Kamban, who drew his materials from the three Sanskrit works, including that of Valmiki, states that after the death of his father Mareesa and his brother were adopted by Sumali, the maternal grandfather of Ravana, as his children, and thus they became the uncles of Ravana (vide Balankam). In this case, Tadaka was in the relationship of a grand-parent to Ravana. But this is a matter that does not affect the main subject of controversy.

(To be Continued).

T. PONNAMBALAM PILLAI.

THE LAW OF KARMA.

BY PROF. S. A. DESAI, M. A., LL. B.

I

THE subject of this paper is "The Law of Karma." This law of Karma proceeds as a corollary from a particular view about God and about the relation between God and man. And as in other cases, so in this case, it will be easier for us to understand this view about God and God's relation to man, if we first have some idea of the view which is quite opposed to it. This latter view is contained in some parts of the old Testament, the Sacred Book of the Jews, especially in that part of it which is entitled the Book of Job. According to this view, God is all and man is naught; for God is perfectly powerful, man is absolutely powerless; God is absolute sovereign subject to no law, man is an abject slave who can claim protection under no law. This being the view about the nature of God and of God's relation to man, it necessarily follows that in whatever state or condition God is pleased to keep man, man has no right even to complain or ask for the reason. Not only this, that is, not only ought no man to complain or ask for the reason as to why God is pleased to reduce him to adversity, but it is an insult to the almighty God that any one should attempt to justify the ways of God towards man.

According to this view, then, God is a perfectly and absolutely imperious being that is bound by no law, not even by any moral or spiritual law, and that feels it below his dignity to condescend to justify his behaviour towards his creations. This conception of God is opposed to another conception according to which God, whatever else he may be, is the embodiment of perfect and absolute justice, that always rewards righteousness and punishes unrighteousness. It is easy to see that, on the first of these two views, according to which God is simply an absolutely arbitrary will, no effort of man, no karma, however good or righteous, can so to say, compel God to bestow any corresponding reward on the agent of that karma. For God is bound by nothing nor can any man claim anything from God. Thus, the fate of man on this view depends solely and absolutely on the favour of an omnipotent but imperious God, arbitrarily granted or withheld. On the other hand according to the other conception of God, that is, according to the

view that God is perfect justice, whatever else he may or may not be, man's fate depends on his own deeds or karma. On this view every man is literally the architect of his own fortune. And this being so, that is absolute justice being an attribute of God, there is no opening left for any arbitrary favour of God to be shown to any particular man or body of men. For if god grants such a favour to any man,—a favour which that man can't claim as a due return for his karma—then so far God would be unjust.

This latter view that God is absolute justice and is therefore bound to observe the law of justice and to treat every man according to his karma or desert, is expressed by what is, in this essay, called the Law of Karma. It is not intended to deal with this Law of Karma in all its aspects. All that we are concerned with in this essay about the Law of Karma is simply its teaching that every act, good or evil, has its fruit attached to it; that if the act is done it is necessarily and inevitably followed by its fruit; and that the man who does the act has to experience that fruit, when the proper time and circumstances arise. From this it necessarily follows that what any man now is, is solely due to what he had been in the past and that what he will be is completely determined by what he now is. In other words, that a man always reaps and must always reap what he has sown.

This view is beautifully expressed in the following passage taken from the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad: "What a man will be is determined by what he now does, that is, by the way in which he now lives. If he now does good, that is if he now lives in a good way he will be good. If he now does evil, that is if he now lives in a bad way he will be bad A man becomes good by good works, a man becomes bad by bad works".* Agains we are told:—"According as a man desires, so he determines; according as he determines, so he acts; and according as he acts, so he attains."‡ For as we learn, from another passage, "when a man dies, that is leaves this world and goes to another, then whatever he has known in this world, whatever he has done in this world, and whatever he has experienced in this world, all that accompanies him." † This passage is explained by Shankaracharya as follows:—"When a man dies, the knowledge which be attained, and the works which he did in this world,

* Brihadaramyaka Upanishad IV. 4, 5.

‡ Brihadaranyaka Upanishad IV. 4, 5.

† Brihadaranyaka Upanishad IV. 4, 2.

follow or accompany his soul to the next. In the above passage *Vidya* or knowledge means all kinds of knowledge, prescribed or forbidden, not prescribed or not forbidden; similarly *Karma* or work means all kinds of works, prescribed or forbidden, not prescribed or not forbidden. Besides knowledge and work, he is also followed or accompained by *Purvaprajña* i. e., the *Samskara* or impression produced by his experience of the fruit of previcus works. It is necessary to suppose that this impression (or *Samskara*) accompanies the soul to the next world; for without it, it will not be possible for the soul to do any act or to experience any fruit of previous works in the next world. For the senses cannot have the skill about any subject which is unfamiliar to them. But the fact is that the senses have such skill previous to practice; and this fact can be explained if we regard them as regulated by the impression (*Samskara*) due to previous experience. And this fact, namely that some men possess in-born skill in certain works, like painting, &c., without practice in this life; and that some men never get the skill in certain works how-ever easy those works may be; this fact is of every-day experience. The same fact is true as regards the possession of skill or being without skill in respect of enjoyment of fruit. All this therefore must be regarded as due to the presence or absence of the impressicn *Samskara* due to experience in previous life. Hence it follows that no one will in this life be capable of any activity or enjoyment which does not correspond to his *Purvaprajña*. This part of the *Sruti* therefore teaches that since *Purvaprajña* is the source of his attaining another body and of his being able to enjoy, a man must in this life attain proper knowledge and do proper works, in order that he may attain after death a body and enjoyment according to his desire.

From all this we learn, that, according to the Law of Karma, what any man is, does or experiences, in this life, is determined by the knowledge he attained, the works he did, and the fruit of his previous works he experienced in a previous life; and that what a man will be in the next life will be determined by the knowledge he attains, the works he does, and the fruit of his previous works he experiences, in this life.

II

Having got a conception of the Law of Karma, let us now turn for a moment to a controversy, of far-reaching consequences to which that Law gave rise. This controversy, that arose out of the Law of Karma, refers to the question:—Is God concerned in this Law of

Karma being fulfilled or realized? This controversy is not as to whether God interferes with the Law of Karma, whether God bestows rewards and punishments which are not strictly in conformity with the Law of Karma as defined above. For it was agreed on all sides that whatever a man gets, or does not get, is exactly in proportion to his desert. The controversy was simply as to whether the Law of Karma executes itself, i. e., distributes rewards and punishments according to desert, or whether God, who made the law himself executes it i. e., distributes rewards and punishments according to desert. To this question, the school of the Vaidic Religion, which is identified with Jaimini, replied that though the Law of Karma was made by God, still being once made the Law executes itself and so does not require the activity on the part of God for the distribution of rewards and punishments according to desert. This view about the Law of Karma may be expressed in the language of the Law of Causation. For Karma or desert is the cause, the corresponding reward or punishment is the effect. Hence the cause, that is, the Karma or desert being there, nothing else is required for its effect, *i. e*, the corresponding reward or punishment to take place. That this view was held by the school of Jaimini is evident from the works both of Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya.

Before referring to the other side of the controversy, it is perhaps worth while to notice that this view about the Law of Karma, held by the school of Jaimini or the *Karmamargis* contained the seed of Buddhism in its negative aspect. For if all that a man is or can be, is wholly and exclusively the result of his Karma, so that the Karma being given, a man cannot but be what his desert makes him to be; and further if the condition in which a man is or will be, is solely dependent on his Karma; so that it is not dependent on God in any sense; then it necessarily follows that all that a man need do is to accumulate good desert by doing good works and to avoid the doing of anything which gives rise to bad desert. In other words, no man need trouble himself about the belief in God, or about the worship or praise of or prayers to God. For even granting that God exists, and that God made the Law of Karma, and that God laid down and let us know what works we ought to do and what works we ought not to do; even though we grant all this, still it is quite useless to do anything which is meant to propitiate God. For even if God exists and we succeed in propitiating him, still God cannot help us as regards what we are and what we can or are to be.

Let us now turn to the other side of the controversy which arose in connection with the question: Is God's activity concerned in the realization or execution of the Law of Karma? This question was answered in the affirmative by the school with which the name of Badarayan is associated. In the language of Shankaracharya the view held by the school of Badarayan is as follows:—*Badarayanah tu Acharyah Purva-uktam eva Isvaram phala-hetum manyate.* Ramanujacharya expresses this view in these words:—*Purva-uktam paramapurushasya eva phala-pradatvam bhagavan Badarayanah manyate.* So, according to the school of Badarayan, or according to the *Gñanamargis* though the Law of Karma is strictly and universally true and is always without an exception operative, still the Law depends upon God for its execution or realisation. This view about the Law of Karma attributed to Badarayan, came to be recognized as an integral part of the Vedantic doctrine of religion and philosophy; is definitely stated in the Brahma Sutras; and is accepted both by Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya. As this view about the Law of Karma is of fundamental importance from the point of view of the development of the vaidic religious thought, the Brahma Sutra in which it is stated and the chief portions of the commentaries on this Sutra by Shankaracharya and Ramanujacharya are here added.

The Brahma Sutra is as follows:—*Phalamata upapatteh srutatvachcha**, that is, fruit proceeds from him, for this view is reasonable, and is also supported by the Shruti. Shankaracharya explains this Sutra as follows:—"The question is whether the well-known threefold fruits of works namely, pleasure, pain, and mixture of pleasure and pain, experienced during the *samsar* state by all beings, whether these threefold fruits of works proceed from works themselves, or from Ishwar. The Sutrakar maintains that the fruits of works proceed from Ishwar because this view is reasonable. For on the one hand it is reasonable to hold that Ishwar who presides over all, who is the cause of the production, subsistence and dissolution of all the varieties of things, who knows all particular times and places, causes the agents of works to experience the fruits corresponding to their works. On the other hand, it cannot be reasonable to hold that works, which come to an end the very moment they are done, bring about the fruits which are experienced after an interval. For that would mean that something that exists is produced by something that does not exist, which is absurd. It may be said that the works come to an end after pro-

* Brahma Sutra III, ii, 38-39.

ducing their fruits, which is experienced by the agent after an interval. But this cannot be maintained; for no fruit can be regarded as produced before it is experienced by the agent. It is only when any pleasure or pain is being experienced by a man that it is, even ordinarily, regarded as fruit of his works. No one regards that pleasure or pain as fruit which is not being experienced by a soul. Now perhaps it may admitted that works do not produce their fruit as soon as they are done or before they come to an end; but it may be maintained that works give rise to *Apurva** and this *Apurva* gives rise to the fruit. But even this cannot be admitted. For *Apurva* being non-intelligent like a piece of wood or stone cannot produce anything unless its activity is directed by something that has intelligence. Besides, there is no evidence to prove the existence of *Apurva*. Perhaps it may be argued that since we must suppose something as the cause which gives rise to fruits of works, we may regard the existence of *Apurva* as proved. But this is not admissible; inasmuch as the admission that Ishwar exists makes this argument devoid of any ground. That Ishwar is the source of the fruits of works is not only proved by arguments, but is also supported by Shruti. For there are Shruti passages like "this indeed is great unborn Paramatma who lives everywhere, and who distributes the fruits of works."

Ramanujacharya explains this Sutra as follows—"Fruits of all works, mentioned in authoritative religious works to be experienced either in this life or in the next, come from the highest Purusha only; and hence the Sutra speaks of fruits in general. This view must be accepted because it is reasonable. For he alone who is all-knowing all-powerful, infinitely generous, can bestow the fruits to be experienced here or hereafter, when he is propitiated by works like sacrifice, gift, offerings, &c. Works being non-intelligent and perishing in a moment cannot be the cause of fruits which are to come into existence after an interval. Shruti also supports this same view."

To this view, a follower of Jaimini is supposed by Shankaracharya to object thus:—"It is not right to hold that Ishwar gives rise to the fruits of works. For in the first place, the fruit of works being of different natures, cannot be regarded as the effect of one cause of a uniform nature like Ishwar. In the second place, if we regard Ishwar

* "That unseen virtue which is a relation superinduced, not before possessed, unseen but efficacious to connect the consequence with its past and remote cause and to bring about at a distant period or in another world the relative effect"—Colebrooke—Ed. *M. Q.R.*

as the cause of the fruits of works, we shall have to regard him as partial and cruel; and, in the third place, if we hold that Ishwar is the cause of the happiness that we enjoy, and not good works, then nobody will do good works for it would be useless or unnecessary to do so".

Shankaracharaya holding the view of Badarayan answers this objection as follows:—"The settled conclusion is that Ishwar gives rise to the fruits of works in conformity either with works themselves or with *Apurva* springing from works, as the case may be. This view necessarily follows from the Shruti according to which Ishwar himself causes men to do good and evil deeds and bestows reward and punishment according to those deeds. For instance we read:—"Ishwar causes the man, whom he wishes to lead to a higher world, to do good deeds; and Ishwar causes the man, whom he wishes to lead to a lower world, to do evil deeds". We learn the same thing also from the Gita. For it says:—"Whichever deity a *baktha* desires to worship with faith, to that deity Ishwar renders his faith firm. Possessed of that faith, he seeks to propitiate that deity; and obtains from it the various beneficial things, he desires; though they are really bestowed on him by Ishwar." Besides, in all the Upanishads everything that is produced is regarded as produced by Ishwar. And since Ishwar creates beings according to their previous works; therefore, Ishwar must be regarded as the cause of the fruits of works. The objections that fruits having different natures cannot be produced by Ishwar who is of uniform nature, &c; such objections have no value; because Ishwar gives rise to fruits in conformity with works."

In the light of the above discussion, we may state the Law of Karma, as interpreted by and as forming an integral part of the Vedanta doctrine of religion and philosophy, as follows:—that Ishwar makes a man in this life, to be, to do, and to experience, what is strictly in conformity with the knowledge he attained, the works he did and the fruit of previous works he experienced, during his past life or lives; and that Ishwar will make a man, in the next life, to be, to do, and to experience what is strictly in conformity with the knowledge he has attained, the works he has done, and the fruits of previous works he has experienced, in this life or in previous lives.

S. A. DESAI.

AN ASTROLOGICAL OFFICE.

BY MR. B. N. BHAJEKAR.

THE recent meeting of Astronomers at Kaladi in the Madras Presidency suggests some thoughts of Astrology. There are hardly any Indian Astronomers who are not Astrologers. There are amongst the educated, few who entirely believe in Astrology and there are very few who entirely disbelieve in the same. There are numbers of gentlemen who will describe to you some stray wonderful fulfilment of some astrological prophecy and a well-known Prince in the Bombay Presidency has been captured by an astrologer. The latter's wonderful prophecies made the Prince a believer although the illustrious Sir T. Madhava Rao for most part of his life called Astrology an illegitimate child of Astronomy. As one, who does not believe from experience Astrology to be a big humbug, and who also declines to take Astrology as any practical guide for life, I think the modern helps to test Astrology and discover its laws if any should be fully utilized. One learns with surprise that although the heathen Romans and Greeks are gone, Astrology has not vanished in Europe. In Paris alone 400 Astrologers, one is told, earn their livelihood. The Indian 'science' of Astrology is contained in many books, but unless one is prepared to say that the science was revealed to the ancients by some all-knowing deity or sage one has to fall back on the other probability that the science is the outcome of the experience of generations of Astrologers' families. If this be so, surely the present age which has discovered the art of printing and the devices for quick transit is immensely more likely to gather experience and foretell events.

Why should not some Prince or Princes start an Astrological Office? Money cannot be any serious difficulty. Let two or three renowned English Astrologers and Indian Astrologers be engaged who will interpret horoscopes. Supposing we start an Astrological Office, say at Baroda or Mysore, it will have to engage the above Astrologers and a staff of clerks. Their business will be to keep a look out on all the ladies in an interesting condition in the city and with the help of midwives and relations to get the exact time of birth. That being secured the office-astrologers should be asked to foretell all events of the new-born and have them recorded stating

reasons. The Janma Kundli may be published in an astrological journal and Astrologers of any other place should be at liberty to give their own written interpretations of the horoscopes with reasons. Indeed it would be better to hold out pecuniary prospects for such outside Astrologers as foretell events correctly. The clerks of the office should continue noting the actual events in every new-born child's life. Diseases, deaths of parents, births of brothers and sisters etc should be recorded. Within 20 years the truths of the science or its imperfections will be clearly brought out by tallying the actual events of life with the forecasts made by the Astrologers. Of course each Astrologer must give in writing his reasons for foretelling any particular event. The Astrological Office will also note the Astronomical phenomenon of all planets at each birth. This may serve as data for building up new theories. Much is likely to be made clear, even within the first 5 years of the existence of the Astrological Office. Will some State start such an office? Supposing this will take time or is impossible, why should not Astrologers like Mr. Suryanarayana Rao of Madras start an organization of their own? Well-known Astrologers in each important city should keep a record of the accurate times of birth of infants in their city, then draw up horoscopes, foretell results, giving reasons and compare actualities with prophecies every year. A comparative record of such an Astrologers' league in the main cities of India will be equally efficacious. Will our Astronomers and Astrologers move in the matter?

B. N. BHAJEKAR.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Buddhism and Christianity in Discussion Face to Face; with an introduction and annotations by Dr. J. M. Peebles, M. D., M. A., Ph. D., and published by Dr. Peeble's Institute of Health, Battle Creek, Michigan, U. S. A.

Dr. J. M. Peebles deserves our thanks for having brought out this excellent booklet containing the reports *in extenso* of the oral debate between the Rev. Migettuwatte, a Buddhist Priest and the Rev. D. Silva, an English clergyman, held at Pantura, Ceylon, on the 26th August 1873. As generally happens in theological controversies, personal attacks from both sides have been to some extent indulged in in this debate also and we know that that is possible only when one is sorely pressed for want of argumentative weapons to fight with. When the intellectual faculties are driven to a corner, human nature generally takes refuge in a violent ebullition of passions calculated not to convince the enemy but to overwhelm him. The two Reverend gentlemen seem at their best when attacking the religion of their opponent and exposing its weak places; but when it comes to defending their own religions they are full of smooth explanations and subtle evasions. The points on which this whole controversy turns are whether, according to Buddhism, man has a soul and if so whether the identical soul receives the reward of its good or bad actions. Now, these are questions that can not be satisfactorily answered without solving the prior question, that standing enigma of existence, the nature of the soul; and although each of the disputants has been allowed a period of four hours to expound his views in, the problem remains as confoundedly mysterious as ever. Doubtless the highly specialistic and abstract terminology which must necessarily abound in a discussion regarding the soul could in no way have made matters easy for the comprehension of the common people. In this discussion, however, the main question does not appear to have been grappled with at all, not even so much as approached, although the Buddhist Priest, more than once, threw out the challenge that the Christian Missionary should give out his views regarding the nature of the soul. Instead of the disputants' narrowing the scope of the discussion and concentrating their attention on this *crux* of the whole question we are treated by them to a string of charges against those ancient

personages, Buddha and Christ, and, on the strength of the personal imperfections, real or fancied, implied in those charges, are asked to condemn also the religions they have founded and propagated Whatever be the use of such discussions to a student of philosophy, there is little doubt that to students of comparative religion, these clerical onslaughts have immense value and significance. We have therefore to thank Dr. Peebles for republishing this piece of religious polemic in a more permanent form and commend it to the attention of our readers.

The Common-sense Bible Teacher: an English Quarterly Journal published by Mr. C. L. Abbott, 275 Charles Street, St. Paul, Minn, U. S. A. $ 1·00 per year. Single Copy 25 cts.

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the first three numbers of this new American Magazine whose aim is stated to be the teaching of the Bible on evolutionary principles. In the execution of this purpose the editor undertakes to bring out a new translation of the New Testament, to arrange the books therein correctly in the order in which they were written and to give the results of the higher criticism by eminent Biblical scholars. From a perusal of the various articles appearing in these numbers, we are convinced that this new magazine has an important function to discharge in chalking out a correct path of study for the Bible classes. The learning and the scientific spirit which pervade many of the contributions deserve all praise and have a value all their own. The most healthy feature about this new journal is its complete freedom from the conventionalities and the anxiety to stand by established dogmas, which are the inevitable concomitants of professional clerical criticism We wish our contemporary all success in its laudable object.

Fun for Leisure Hours: by Mr. Panchu Gopal Das; published by Vaidya Shastri Manishanker Govindji, Atank Nigrah Pharmacy, Jamnagar, Kathiawar.

The riddles and puzzles which have been gathered together in this booklet originally appeared in the *Students' Chronicle* of Dacca. Many of them are interesting and will, we hope, be useful to beguile a tedious half-hour. Appealing as they do to the reasoning faculties they hardly deserve the name 'fun', which arises only when the sense of the ludicrous in one is touched. The pamphlet contains geometrical and arithmetical Puzzles, hidden words and square words, charades and a card trick and will be sent by the publisher gratis and post free to any one who applies for it.

Lal Mohun Ghose, Sir Syed Ahmed Khan: Two biograhical sketches published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras. Price as. 4. each.

Messrs G. A. Natesan &. Co., have recently added two valuable sketches to their useful serial: *Biographies of Eminent Indians.* The lives of these two great Indians, one an eminent orator and the other an indefatigable worker, will amply repay perusal. Syed Ahmed's many-sided activities set before our eyes concrete lessons of self-help, while the patriotic passion of Lal Mohun calls for emulation in the vigorous pleading for the cause of India at the bar of British democracy. The sketches are enlivened by copious extracts from the utterances of these great men which throw considerable light on their character as public men and on the attitude they maintained towards the ruling power. We heartily commend these booklets to our readers, especially to the younger generation, as they may find therein guidance for their conduct and a model for their copy.

The Tonsure of Hindu Widows: an essay by Mr. M. Subramanyam, B A., B L., published by Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras. Price As. eight.

It is gratifying to see that the Madras Hindu Association has been doing, in its own way, some work in the field of social reform. It has begun well to grapple with the simpler and by far the easier questions of reform Though to the radical reformer, who advocates reform of a root and branch kind even from the start, this may look as over-cautiousness, if not pusillanimity, yet considerations of popular ignorance and prejudice demand only a wary beginning. "Half a loaf is better than no bread." On that principle at least we shall have to welcome such publications as *Marriage after Puberty* and *Tonsure of Hindu Widows* issued by the Association. Strangely enough the evils which these brochures seek to combat are evils peculiar to the Aryan society and from which the Dravidian population are happily free. Though here and there blind imitation of the Aryan manners and customs has driven some Non-Aryans to perform ante-puberty marriages, the irrational cruelty of the tonsure of widows has indeed been so flagrant as not to find favour even with those docile followers. The pamphlet before us is divided into three parts: part I dealing with the history of the subject, part II with the textual authorities and part III with Custom and Public opinion. The obstacles to reform have been summarized in the third part as follows:—(1) Resistance to innovation (2) The force of Public opinion

(3) superstition and (4) Religious scruples. "The best means of overcoming all obstacles is to facilitate the conditions for widows abandoning the practice generally. Diffusion of a knowledge of the true authorities on the subject is for this purpose essential. When public opinion is educated, people would cease to look on widows retaining the hair, with shocked feelings. When this stumbling block in the way of widows is removed, the practice of shaving will fast become a thing of the past". Oh! how we wish that it would!

Agricultural Industries in India: by Mr Seedick R. Sayani, with an introduction by Sir Vitaldhas Damodar Thackersey, published by Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras. Price Re. one.

To the industrially-backward India, a book like the one we have been favoured with is a welcome publication. Within the short compass of 123 pages the author has compressed a deal of valuable information on such subjects as agriculture, lac industry, manures, sericulture, apiculture, floriculture, cattle farming, dairy industry, poultry raising and other subsidiary industries. In the first section are given some general considerations which should weigh with those who are interested in the agricultural Problem of India. Special attention is drawn to the following points:—The selection of land, selection of seeds, methods of cultivation, economy of water, improvement of seeds, introduction of new crops, suitable rotation of crops, use of suitable manures, improvement and management of cattle and the gradual conversion of the export trade of raw products into that of manufactured articles. After this follows a series of notes containing much special information of a valuable kind on the production of such articles as rice, wheat, cotton, sugar cane, jute, oil seeds, sunn hemp, camphor, lemon grass oil, rami, rubber, potatoes, tea, coffee, tobacco, &c. We have no hesitation whatever to recommend this little book to those who have an idea of enriching themselves and their motherland by following the peaceful profession of the plough. The price one rupee is moderate enough, considering the fund of information the book places at our disposal.

The Saiva Religion: a paper read before the Convention of Religions at Calcutta, by Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai, B. A., B. L., and published in the Siddhanta Deepika of Madras. No. 1, Vol, X July 1909.

Ramanuja and Vaishnavaism: by Prof. M. Rangacharya, M. A., printed at the Bramavadin Press, Madras, 1909.

These two religious papers may profitably be noticed together.

They educidate each other no less by their close resemblances than by the striking points of contrast in their subject-matter. Mr. J. M. Nallaswami Pillai and Prof M. Rangacharaya need no introduction to the literati of this presidency. They are well-known by their numerous writings. Of all religio-philosophical systems that have found a home in this land the two most prominent are the schools of *Saiva Siddhantam* and *Visishtadvaitam*. It is these schools that have secured the largest following; and it is these schools wherein great intellects have labored to bring down airy philosophy to touch the hard realities of practical life. While Mr. Nallaswami has given us a lucid exposition of the principles and tenets of the *Savia* religion, Prof. Rangacharya's treatment of the allied religion *Vaishnavasuism* is equally illuminating and exhaustive. Both of them glance back and try to find in that ancient repository, the Vedas, some basis for their respective religions and console themselves with the idea that by the fact of their vedic origin and the course of their later development their religion alone, to the exclusion of other religions, could justifiably be styled the universal religion or the path of truth. It would be beyond the scope of this succinct review if we entered into a detailed examination of the doctrines of these contending schools and took upon ourselves the duty of appraising their relative values. We shall however take this opportunity of adding that *Saiva Siddhantam* of Nilakanta Sivacharya and *Visishtadvaitam* of Ramanuja, like the *Advaitam* of Sankara, are both systems of compromise between the pure religion of the Veads, wherein *personal* deity is seen to be all in all and the pure philosophy of the post-upanishadic period, like the Sankhya system, wherein *personal* deity has "no local habitation or a name". Of the numerous deities of the Vedic pantheon, the *Trimurtis*, comprising Brahma the creator, Vishnu the sustainer, and Siva the destroyer, came to be singled out in later times for more prominent and more continuous worship than others and among the *Trimurtis* themselves, Vishnu and Siva in course of time succeeded in ousting Brahma from the field. For practical purposes, therefore, there were only two systems of pure religion, one worshipping Siva the destroyer on account of religious fear and the other worshipping Vishnu the preserver on account of religious love. These two pure forms of religion standing at one pole of thought and the pure form of Philosophy, or systematization or unification of cosmic knowledge, occupying the other, naturally there arose a necessity for bringing about a compromise between these opposing systems. This compromise was, however

made in two different ways. In the Advaita system of Sankara, whose investigation was carried on in the dry light of reason, there was more philosophy and less religion and in the qualified advaitam (qualified Dwaitam or Dualism would be the more appropriate name) of Nilakanta Sivacharya and Ramanujacharya there was more religion and less philosophy owing to the emotional elements these latter have brought to the solution of the great problem which confronted them.

The Provincial Judicial Service of Bengal and East Bengal and Assam, published by Mr. R. Chatterjee, 210-3-1 Cornwallis Street, Calcutta. Price As. 8.

Mr. R. Chatterjee has really done a good piece of service by publishing this brochure which gives in a short compass a clear summary of the many hardships under which the members of the subordinate judiciary of Bengal labour. A long catalogue of grievances are herein enumerated and it is to be hoped that this would attract the sympathetic attention of Government and make them ameliorate the lot of the hard-worked munsifs and of the subordinate judges in their service. As a striking instance of hardship we may single out the practice of granting or withholding promotion to the members of the judicial branch of the Provincil Civil Service, on the strength of the 'secret reports' of District Judges, reports which the persons concerned have not the least opportunity of getting an inkling of and of meeting with their explanations. It is stated that one of the most estimable of men and officers was kept out of his long-deserved subordinate-judgeship because of his having been described in the secret reports as "erratic"—a very vague and indefinite epithet, in all conscience, to describe an official!

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Lord Morley and Lord Ripon: Sketches of their Lives, published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras. Price As. 4 each.

Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya's Life is a new addition to Natesan's well-known serial, *Biographies of Eminent Indians.* Pandit Madan Mohan is a moderate Congressman and a leader who commands the confidence of a large number of his countrymen. With all his deep respect for established authority and unshakeable faith in constitutional agitation, he is one of the sturdiest champions of the popular cause which India possesses at present. His recent utterance on the Press Bill in the Viceregal Council, although it counted for naught, has gone a great way to enhance his reputation for sterling

independence. It is well that the record of work of such a politician should be chronicled in a convenient form so as to be within the reach of all. We welcome also the new *Friends of India* series wherein appear two very interesting biographical sketches, those of Lord Morley and Lord Ripon. It is hardly necessary for us, at the present moment, to dwell on the many beneficent reforms effected in the Indian administration by these two great Englishmen. They are matters of contemporary history or come within the living memory of many of us. This new series will, we hope, spread a correct knowledge of these English statesmen among the vast Indian population and lead them also to gauge the forces these good Englishmen have had to contend against in securing for us the blessings of a good and liberal Government.

The Indians of South Africa, by Mr. Henry S. L. Polak, published by Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras Price Re 1.

The book before us furnishes sad reading of the legal disabilities, nay the indignities, that have been heaped upon our fellow-countrymen in the British South African Colonies. Mr. Polak's work is a clear and powerful *expose* of the barbarities that are being perpetrated in the name of efficient and good government but which are really the outcome of that worst of all prejudices—Race Prejudice. The Immigration Restriction Law, the Law regulating trading licenses, the Indenture Laws and a host of other equally vexatious laws are all so many engines of oppression to grind down the few hapless Indians who have left our shores in search of a living. We confess that we cannot read with patience the tales of mute suffering, wanton insults, persistent persecution, and what is more harrowing than these, of silent suicides, that are unfolded to us in these pages. They are so numerous and so barefaced as to make any man of culture and ordinary human sympathy hang down his head in shame and confess that after all there are many dark spots beneath the pomp and glitter of western civilization that require careful probing. The only redeeming feature about this struggle is that the meek Indian has shown himself to be a man of mettle and has held fast to that most powerful of all weapons—Passive Resistance. If he persists, as he ought to for justice is on his side, he is bound to win. The debate recently opened by the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale in the Viceregal Council *re* the supply of indentured Indian Labour to South Africa is an happy augury of the success which awaits our brethren in that unhappy country. Though late the motherland has at last awakened to stand by her

children in the hour of their trouble and tribulation; and this we are of opinion is in no small degree due to the indefatigable labours Mr. H. S. L. Polak, the delegate to India, who has been travelling throughout this country and addressing large audiences on the one subject of his mission.

Tamil Songs in Malayalam characters with their musical notation composed by Mr. T. Lakshmana Pillai, B. A., and printed at the Sri-mula Vilasam Press and the Printer's Jobbing Press, Trivandrum.

We have received for review a collection of twenty songs (Vol. I) composed by Mr. T. Lakshmana Pillai, B. A. The songs themselves have been composed in Tamil, but they have been printed in Malayalam characters for the convenience of the people of this coast. The songs are arranged in orthodox style, beginning with the *Ghana ragas*, so that many popular songs of this well-known composer have not been included in the present volume. It is a great help to students of music generally that each song in the volume is transcribed according to a new and simple system of musical notation, which is apparently sufficient to preserve in a permanent form the beauties of the compositions. We have great pleasure in welcoming this publication and venture to express a hope that it will be soon followed by other volumes containing the more famous songs of this popular composer.

Sutikamritam: A Work on Midwifery in Malayalam verse by Mr. P. M. Govinda Vaidyar, printed at the Ananda Press, Trivandrum

This book is a compilation in Malayalam by Mr. P. M. Govindan Vaidyar of Kaikara mainly on the subject of midwifery. It treats also of connected subjects from 'conception' to the 'care of infants.' The compiler has laid under contribution the original authorities in Sanskrit such as *Astangahridya*, *Charaka* &c., and the volume is apparently a *precis* of the *Ayurvedic* lore on the subjects treated of. We cannot understand why this book containing as it does maxims for the guidance of all, should have been written in *verse*. It is true that our forefathers who lived in the days when there was no printing press composed even their scientific treatises in verse to assist their preservation by memory and not with any purpose of embellishing them with flowers culled from the fairy land of poesy. But that necessity has now disappeared and consequently an author who could easily and more profitably express his thoughts on a subject of practical importance in simple prose would be considered to be mis-spending his energy if he were bent upon giving a poetic garb to

thoughts prosaic in the extreme. It is however hoped that this pamphlet would prove useful at least to some who can stand a dose of dry verse and have besides leisure at their command.

Light on Life: Five Spiritual Discourses by Swami Baba Premanand Bharati, published by Messrs G. A. Natesan Co., Madras. Price As. 8.

"Light on Life" is a selection of five spiritual discourses delivered to American audiences by Swami Baba Premanand Bharati. In the first discourse entitled '*The Real Real Life*' the Swami emphasises the fact that real life is not the life of the body, nor is it even the life of the mind; but it is something beyond these, the 'Spiritual Life', "the life of soul-consciousness, the life which we live conscious of our Soul." *Have you loved* is the next discourse wherein love, disinterested, pure, self-sacrificing love, is stated to be the essence of divinity and one and all are exhorted to throw open the windows of their soul for the "radiant" "All-pervading" Love to stream in or out. *Do we live, Thought Force, Sages, Saints and Sons of God* are the other sermons in the volume which are pitched in the same spiritual key. These lectures have their own value to the matter-ridden, dollar-worshipping, commercial West and the Swami has accordingly succeeded in gathering a large flock round him in America. We sincerely hope that the religious propaganda in which the Swami is engaged will bring India and America into closer union than heretofore and knit them in bonds of spiritual fellowship.

The Congress, Conferences and Conventions of 1909: A collection of the speeches, presidential and other, delivered in the Indian National Congress and other popular Conferences held in the closing week of 1909, together the resolutions passed therein, compiled and published by Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co, Madras. Price As. 12.

As usual the well-known publishers, Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., have brought out in a handy volume, the addresses delivered at the Indian National Congress and the Industrial, Social, Temperance, Kshatriya and Hindu Conferences held at Lahore in December last. They have also extended the usefulness of this volume by including in it the speeches delivered on the occasion of the opening of the Industrial and Agricultural Exhibition, Lahore, the Mahomedan Educational Conference, Rangoon, the Rajput Conference, Lucknow, the Theosophical Convention, Benares and the Christian Endeavour Convention at Agra. The speeches of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya as President of the Congress, of the Hon'ble Mr. G. K. Gokhale on the

Transval Indian question, of Tikka Sahib of Nabha as President of the Social Conference, of His Honour Sir Louis Dane in opening the Industrial Exhibition of Lahore and of Sir P. C Chatterjee as President of the Punjab Hindu Conference may be singled out for prominent mention as containing weighty sentiments and principles for practical guidance that should find favour with every Indian Patriot. The volume is further embellished with the portraits of the Presidents of the Congress and the various Conferences and Conventions. The publishers offer the book to the subscribers of their *Indian Review* at half the original price, as a concession.

The Muslim Review: Printed and published by M. Ramzan Ali at the City Press, Allahabad Manager's office: 7. Albert Road, Allabhad. Subscription Rs 5 per annum; For students Rs. 4

We thank the publisher for sending us the first two numbers of the *Muslim Review*, an excellent monthly journal, evidently started with the idea of serving the interests of our Mahomedan brethren. A review of this kind is a long-felt want in the moslem world of India and we therefore hasten to welcome our new contemporary as supplying that want. From the educational, social, religious and political points of view so much remains to be done to our Mahomedan fellow-subjects, that there is practically a wide and unoccupied field for our contemporary to work in. Judging from the articles appearing in these numbers and the printing and general get-up of the Review, we have no doubt that it will attain easy popularity with its readers. In addition to the original articles, which are interesting enough, we have the following sections: Survey of the Muslim World, Editorial reflections under the title *Recent episodes*, Literary Notices and Utterances of the day.

M. K. Gandhi—A great Indian: published by Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., Madras Price As 4.

This is a Sketch of the Life of Mr M. K. Gandhi, one of the most eminent and self-sacrificing men that Modern India has produced. It describes the early days of Mr. M. K. Gandhi's life, his mission and work in South Africa, his character, his strivings, and his hopes. A perusal of this Sketch, together with the selected speeches and addresses that are appended, gives an insight into the springs of action that have impelled this remarkable and saintly man to surrender every material thing in life for the sake of an Ideal that he ever essays to realise, and will be a source of inspiration to those who understand that statesmanship, moderation, and selflessness are the greatest

qualities of a patriot. The Sketch contains an illuminating investigation into the true nature of passive resistance by Mr. Gandhi, which may be taken as an authoritative expression of the spirit of the South African struggle.

New Indian Tales.

Mr. C. Hayavadana Rau, B. A., B. L., Fellow of the Royal Anthropological Institute of London and the author of that entertaining little book "Tales of Komati Wit and Wisdom," has brought out another collection of nineteen amusing and instructive tales under the title "New Indian Tales" These will make even the most morose enjoy a heartly laugh. Messrs. G. A. Natesan & Co., Esplanade, Madras are the publishers and the book is priced at annas four.

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of *Indian Art* from Messrs G. A. Natesan & Co., and *Castes and Tribes of South India* from the Government Press, Madras, and these shall be reviewed in our next number.